LIFE AND LETTERS OF HERBERT SPENCER

VI. 11. 1908

M.H.P.Phyfe.

June 11th, 1908,

LIFE AND LETTERS OF HERBERT SPENCER

VOLUME I

HERBERT SPENCER'S WORKS.

SYNTHETIC PHILOSOPHY.

(1.) FIRST PRINCIPLES $2.00
I. The Unknowable. II. Laws of the Knowable.

(2.) THE PRINCIPLES OF BIOLOGY. Vol. I. 2.00
I. The Data of Biology. II. The Inductions of Biology.
III. The Evolution of Life.

(3.) THE PRINCIPLES OF BIOLOGY. Vol. II. . . . 2.00
IV. Morphological Development. V. Physiological Development.
VI. Laws of Multiplication.

(4.) THE PRINCIPLES OF PSYCHOLOGY. Vol. I. . . 2.00
I. The Data of Psychology. III. General Synthesis.
II. The Inductions of Psychology. IV. Special Synthesis.
V. Physical Synthesis.

(5.) THE PRINCIPLES OF PSYCHOLOGY. Vol. II. . . 2.00
VI. Special Analysis. VIII. Congruities.
VII. General Analysis. IX. Corollaries.

(6.) THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY. Vol. I. . . . 2.00
I. The Data of Sociology. II. The Inductions of Sociology.
III. The Domestic Relations.

(7.) THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY. Vol. II. . . . 2.00
IV. Ceremonial Institutions. V. Political Institutions.

(8.) THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY. Vol. III. . . . 2.00
VI. Ecclesiastical Institutions. VII. Professional Institutions.
VIII. Industrial Institutions.

(9.) THE PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS. Vol. I. 2.00
I. The Data of Ethics. II. The Induction of Ethics.
III. The Ethics of Individual Life.

(10.) THE PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS. Vol. II. 2.00
IV. The Ethics of Social Life : Justice.
V. The Ethics of Social Life : Negative Beneficence.
VI. The Ethics of Social Life : Positive Beneficence.

ESSAYS, SCIENTIFIC, POLITICAL, AND SPECULATIVE.
3 vols. 6.00

SOCIAL STATICS. The Man *versus* The State 2.00

STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY. (No. 5, Int. Scientific Series) . . 1.50

EDUCATION . . . . . Cloth, 1.25

VARIOUS FRAGMENTS . . . . . Cloth, 1.25

FACTS AND COMMENTS . . . 12mo. Cloth, Net, 1.20

The above 18 vols. . . . . 12mo. Cloth, 33.00

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY . . 2 vols. 8vo. Illus. Cloth, Net, 5.50

D. APPLETON AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

LIBRARY
MANCHESTER COLLEGE

LIFE AND LETTERS OF HERBERT SPENCER

BY

DAVID DUNCAN, LL.D.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME I

D. APPLETON AND COMPANY
NEW YORK MCMVIII

Copyright, 1908, by
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY

Published May, 1908

TO

MY WIFE

LIBRARY
C. 1
MANCHESTER COLLEGE

PREFACE

A WORD or two seems necessary by way of explanation of the publication of a biography of Mr. Herbert Spencer, within a few years of the publication of his voluminous *Autobiography*. Twenty-eight years ago, while I was at home on furlough, Mr. Spencer obtained from me a promise to write his *Life*. In subsequent years, partly owing to his fears that his own life might not be prolonged, and partly because he thought that my absence in India would render it difficult, if not impossible, for me to fulfil my promise, he made other arrangements. These other arrangements, however, fell through. Hence the question, in a letter to me, dated 10 May, 1893: "Does the assent which you gave years ago still hold, and is it likely to hold?" On receiving an affirmative answer, Mr. Spencer had the following paragraph inserted in his Will:—"I request that the said David Duncan will write a Biography in one volume of moderate size, in which shall be incorporated such biographical materials as I have thought it best not to use myself, together with such selected correspondence and such unpublished papers as may seem of value, and shall include the frontispiece portrait and the profile portraits, and shall add to it a brief account of the part of my life which has passed since the date at which the Autobiography concludes."

Mr. Spencer was impressed with the truth that one's estimate of one's self is sure to err on the side of excess or defect. To say nothing of the limitations of memory, the mere assumption of the attitude of narrator of one's own life is unfavourable to correct representation. Peculiarities of intellectual and moral character also interfere with the adjustments of lights and shades and colours. Vanity, in one case, self-depreciation, in another, will prevent a well-balanced estimate of one's self being arrived at. While not trying to hide his shortcomings, Mr. Spencer, like all the finer natures, shrank from parading the more attractive and lovable aspects of his character—thus permitting an apparent justification for the opinion that he was "all brains and no heart." This is one of the erroneous opinions which will, it is hoped, be removed by perusal of the following pages.

The existence of the *Autobiography*, which covers sixty-two years of Mr. Spencer's life, has added to the difficulties of my task. The road traversed by him has had to be traversed by me; but I have endeavoured to avoid needless repetition, while omitting nothing that has seemed necessary to form a continuous and complete narrative. Of the remaining twenty-one years, the volume now published constitutes the only authoritative record. To avoid multiplication of references, a note has been inserted at the beginning of each chapter—from chapter i. to chapter xvi.—to show the corresponding chapters in the *Autobiography*.

I have not aimed at giving an exposition or criticism of the philosophy of Evolution. Even had such an aim been in accordance with Mr. Spencer's wishes, it would have been impossible, within the prescribed limits, to do justice either to the Life or to the Philosophy, had the attainment of both ends been attempted. Expositions and estimates of his Philosophy have been plentiful enough. The fact of the matter is that we stand as yet too near the stupendous edifice to form a correct idea of its proportions and grandeur. The letters, so freely quoted in the following pages, will, however, it is hoped, while indicating the growth of Mr. Spencer's striking and many-sided character, throw new light upon the development of his scheme of thought. Very important in this respect is the appendix on "The Filiation of Ideas," written by him in 1898-99, and left for publication in this volume. Being an intellectual history of himself, it elucidates the natural evolution of the Evolution theory, besides serving as a sketch plan of the Synthetic Philosophy. In itself an exceedingly valuable document, its value is enhanced by the fact that it was his final contribution to the theory of evolution.

Mr. Spencer outlived most of his contemporaries and, as a consequence, my opportunities of direct consultation with literary and scientific friends, with whom he was on terms of friendship and intimacy, have been few. Even his correspondence with those who pre-deceased him has in several cases disappeared. To those, however, who have kindly placed his letters at my disposal, or given

me permission to publish their letters to him, or favoured me with personal reminiscences, I have to express my grateful thanks. To my co-trustee, Dr. H. Charlton Bastian, and to Mr. Henry R. Tedder, Secretary and Librarian of the Athenæum, both of whom have assisted me by reading proofs and by many valuable suggestions, I owe a special debt of gratitude. Mr. Walter Troughton, besides placing at my disposal his intimate knowledge of Mr. Spencer's life from 1889 to 1903, has been good enough to relieve me entirely of correspondence and arrangements connected with the preparation of the illustrations. Though his help has been rendered in great measure out of regard for Mr. Spencer's memory, he has at the same time earned my cordial thanks.

D. DUNCAN.

Office of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Trustees,
Whitcomb House,
Whitcomb Street, W.C.
9 *February,* 1908.

CONTENTS

VOL. I

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	FAMILY HISTORY AND PARENTAGE.....	1
II.	CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH (*April*, 1820—*November*, 1837)	9
III.	ENGINEERING (*November*, 1837—*April*, 1841).	28
IV.	LITERATURE WOOED BUT NOT WON (*April*, 1841—*December*, 1844)	42
V.	ENGINEERING ONCE MORE (*January*, 1845—*December*, 1848)	64
VI.	HIS FIRST BOOK (*December*, 1848—*July*, 1853)	74
VII.	A NEW PSYCHOLOGY (*July*, 1853—*December*, 1857)	92
VIII.	THE UNIFICATION OF KNOWLEDGE (*January*, 1858—*May*, 1860)	110
IX.	FIRST PRINCIPLES (*May*, 1860—*February*, 1863)	130
X.	BIOLOGY (*September*, 1862—*March*, 1867)....	141
XI.	SUNSHINE AND SHADOW (*December*, 1865—*July*, 1867)	165
XII.	PSYCHOLOGY AND DESCRIPTIVE SOCIOLOGY (*July*, 1867—*October*, 1872)	180
XIII.	THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY (*December*, 1869—*January*, 1874)	206
XIV.	DISTASTE FOR HONOURS AND CEREMONIAL (*January*, 1874—*December*, 1877).....	222

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
XV.	The Secularization of Morals (*January,* 1878—*October,* 1879)	255
XVI.	Egypt and America (*November,* 1879—*December,* 1882)	271
XVII.	A Political Creed for True Liberalism (*January,* 1883—*December,* 1885)	302
XVIII.	Religious Discussion—A Suppressed Book (*March,* 1883—*December,* 1885)	335
XIX.	The Factors of Organic Evolution (*January,* 1886—*September,* 1889)	359
XX.	In Defence of Freedom and Justice (*September,* 1889—*December,* 1891)	390

LIST OF FULL-PAGE ILLUSTRATIONS

VOL. I

	FACING PAGE
HERBERT SPENCER AT THE AGE OF NINETEEN.....*Frontispiece*	
NO. 27 EXETER STREET, DERBY.....	10
NO. 31 WILMOT STREET, DERBY.....	12
GEORGE HOLME, FROM A SKETCH MADE BY HERBERT SPENCER ABOUT 1842.....	44
MRS. ORDISH, FROM A SKETCH MADE BY HERBERT SPENCER ABOUT 1842	50
EDWARD LOTT, FROM A SKETCH MADE BY HERBERT SPENCER ABOUT 1842	68
HERBERT SPENCER, FROM A PHOTOGRAPH TAKEN IN 1855..	100
FAC-SIMILE OF A PROOF, FROM THE *Principles of Biology*	160
HERBERT SPENCER, FROM A PHOTOGRAPH TAKEN AT THE AGE OF FORTY-SIX.....	166
CHARLES DARWIN.....	212
EDWARD L. YOUMANS.....	366
LOCH ALINE, ARGYLLSHIRE.....	410
ARDTORNISH HOUSE, LOCH ALINE.....	412

LIFE AND LETTERS
OF HERBERT SPENCER

VOLUME I

CHAPTER I

FAMILY HISTORY AND PARENTAGE

Towards the end of the sixteenth century Thomas and Balthazar de Henzu or de Hennezel, with other Huguenots, driven by religious persecution from Lorraine, to which they seem to have migrated from Bohemia, took up their abode near Stourbridge. Other immigrants, apparently also of Bohemian origin and bearing the name afterwards known as Hemus, appeared on the scene about the same time. A century earlier, families of the name of Brettell, connected seemingly with the de Breteuils of Normandy, had settled in the same locality.

The neighbourhood of Stourbridge was a favourite resort of foreign immigrants. Tradition has it that the famous clay was discovered in the sixteenth century by wandering glass-makers from Lorraine, and that the manufacture of glass, begun about 1556, was introduced by Hungarians. These traditions are in harmony with the supposition that the Henzeys, Hemuses, &c., migrated

---

Note.—*Autobiography*, i., chaps. i., ii., iii., "Family Antecedents."

from Bohemia to Lorraine, and thence to England, taking with them their skill in the manufacture of glass. They would naturally settle in a locality where they could carry on to advantage their native industry, especially if it had the additional attraction of being the adopted home of other exiles like themselves.

Marriages between families thus brought together would be likely to take place. Unions of Brettells and Henzeys are, in fact, recorded in the sixteenth century, and the register of the parish of Oldswinford, within which Stourbridge has grown up, shows how common these unions were in the two centuries following. One entry is of special interest. In June, 1740, Joseph Brettell, a farmer of Wordsley, married Elizabeth Hemus. Joseph Brettell and Elizabeth Hemus were Spencer's great-grandparents on the mother's side. To him the chief interest in this genealogy lay in the evidence it furnished of descent from families who had resisted arbitrary authority. The non-conformity of the Brettells, Henzeys, and Hemuses in religious matters remained with them. Besides a daughter, Jane, Joseph and Elizabeth Brettell had two sons, Jeremiah and John, who became well-known Wesleyan ministers. One Joseph Brettell, a relative of Jane Brettell's, was licensed as a local preacher by John Wesley. A copy of a letter, dated March 25, 1785, shows the founder of Wesleyanism to have been a strict disciplinarian, who took care that his adherents did not interpret non-conformity as liberty to do as they pleased.

You think it your duty to call sinners to repentance. Make full proof hereof and we shall rejoice to own you as a fellow labourer.

Observe.—You are not to ramble up and down, but to go where I direct and there only.

(signed) JOHN WESLEY.

Jane Brettell married John Holmes, a widower, whom Spencer remembered as a broken-down old man, whose "strong sense of responsibility and obligation remained dominant even when his faculties were failing." The verses referred to in the *Autobiography* (i., 16) as exhibiting "some small power of literary expression," caused John Holmes searchings of heart as to the consistency of verse-making with religious principles. "Some of the expressions, I know, are very lively," he writes to his daughter by way of apology, "though they may be overlooked, as poetry is confined to words." About Mrs. Holmes it may be said that, in judging of her character as portrayed by her grandson one has to bear in mind that his estimate was derived mainly from his father, who was biassed, owing to her long opposition to her daughter's marriage.

The Derbyshire Spencers with whom we are concerned had lived in the parish of Kirk Ireton for centuries. The earliest entry in the parish register is dated 1581, but Spencer's ancestry cannot, with certainty, be traced further back than to about the middle of the seventeenth century, at which time there lived two brothers, Thomas and William Spencer. From Thomas the lineage can be traced to 1762, when Spencer's grandfather, Matthew, was born. The family property at this time consisted of a few houses and two fields. Early in life Matthew Spencer settled in Derby, becoming assistant in St. Peter's parish school. In the *Derby Mercury* for December, 1790, Mr. Frear, the retiring head of the school,

recommends as his successor Matthew Spencer, who had been his assistant for many years. Twelve months later Matthew Spencer advertises a school in the Green Lane, "where he instructs youths in Reading, Writing, Merchants' accounts, Mensuration (with Land Surveying), Algebra, &c. He can accommodate a few young gentlemen at his house. Terms: Entrance fee, £1 1s. Board and Education, 13 guineas per annum." On his death in 1831 the Kirk Ireton property passed to his son George, in consideration of his long residence with his father and of his having rendered assistance in the school; the Green Lane house was left to the youngest son, William.

Matthew Spencer's wife, Catherine Taylor, was the grand parent whom Spencer knew best, she having lived till he was 23 years of age. "She showed," says her grandson, "no marked intellectual superiority. Indeed, I remember my mother expressing her wonder that from her and from my grandfather there should have proceeded a number of sons who, on the whole, were decidedly marked in their abilities." But of the superiority of her moral nature, "the evidences are unquestionable. My own recollections verify the uniform testimony of her sons that she had all the domestic virtues in high degrees." About the age of nineteen she came under the influence of John Wesley, whom she heard preach in the market-place of Derby amid much insult and persecution, and whose company and conversation she had afterwards frequent opportunities of enjoying.

The six children who grew up "formed a fine family in point of physique, all the sons but one ranging from 5 ft. 10 in. to 6 ft., well-looking in feature, and though

not as a family very robust, still tolerably well-balanced." They were characterised by individuality almost amounting to eccentricity, by pugnacious tenacity in holding to their opinions, by self-assertiveness, and by disregard for authority. In Henry the family traits were softened by the saving grace of humour; in John they were intensified by overweening egotism. Remembrance of the genial nature and kindly ways of the former was one of the motives that, in after life, prompted Spencer's generosity to the children and grandchildren; whereas the unfavourable impression made on his youthful mind by what he knew and heard about the latter was never entirely effaced. Thomas, the best known of the family, was the uncle whose influence on the nephew was the most marked and abiding. William diverged the least from current opinions, and perhaps on that account made less impression on his nephew intellectually; but the memory of his fine, generous character was cherished by Spencer to the last.

Spencer's father is described as a singularly handsome man. Although his constitution gave way a year or two after his marriage, and ill-health dogged his footsteps for the remainder of his days, he lived to the age of 76. Before he married he had saved enough to purchase several small houses, and to advance money to enable Thomas to go to Cambridge. By 1824, however, sickness and the failure of the lace-machine venture had told on his finances; whereas Thomas had already entered on a career of moderate prosperity, leading George to say: "Now the scales are turned upon us; you the lender, the borrower I." With intellectual abilities in some respects remarkable there went a singular lack of well-balanced

judgment in practical affairs. In some things absurdly economical, he was in others absurdly extravagant. He did not weigh the cost of means against the value of ends. "While always occupied, he was often occupied rather about trivialities than about large things: large things had a tendency to paralyse him." He himself confesses this: "I find that I have, and particularly since my illness, a constant propensity to neglect those things of the greatest consequence and am particularly punctual in attending to those of the least." His studies were mainly in science, natural causation being the ruling idea. Of ethical, political, and metaphysical questions, he never made a systematic study. As for literature, books were read less for their subject-matter than as a field for verbal criticism. His composition was appropriate, clear, and pure, though not forcible. Firmness, reaching almost to obstinacy, argumentativeness, disregard of authority, censoriousness—were his in high degree. Excessively conscientious himself, he was prone to be suspicious of others. Writing from Paris to his future wife he gives as a reason for addressing the letter to "H. Holmes" instead of "Miss Holmes," that the gentleman who was to convey the letter would "not be tempted to open it"! "In public affairs especially, instead of taking some obvious cause for an act, he was habitually seeking for some secret, underhand intention as having prompted it." In dress and social intercourse, as well as in opinions, his independence showed itself. While frank and suave in manner, no man laid less store by the conventions of society. He took an active part in most of the great movements of his day. "His eyes were ever open to any evil to be rectified or good to be done."

In common with his brothers (writes Spencer), he was brought up under strong religious impressions; and up to the age of 35 he was in the habit of going through the usual religious observances—not, however, domestically. But with the extension of his independent thinking in all directions he gradually became more and more alien in religious opinion from those he was brought up with; and, giving up the worship of the Wesleyans, attended for a considerable number of years a chapel of the Quakers: not because he agreed with them in their peculiarities, but because it was a course which allowed of free scope to his own views. He had become very much opposed to all forms of priesthood, and among others to that of the Wesleyans; and I doubt not that the Quakers commended themselves to him as not having any order of priests. In later life he separated himself still further from current opinions, ending, indeed, by agreeing in the religious views I had set forth. Not, indeed, that he ever distinctly said so; but observations he made in his last years concerning the current creed implied that he had abandoned it. And this illustrates what was a speciality of his nature shown in an unusual degree; namely, that he remained plastic in opinion to a very late period in life. Most men, and still more most women, early become fixed. He went on modifying, and continued his modifiability to the last.

Spencer's mother, Harriet Holmes, is described as of medium height, with a spare figure, and, when young, as decidedly good-looking. A journal she kept for over a year when she was eighteen reveals an amiable character, strong on the moral side. This also comes out in a letter to her parents with reference to their opposition to her engagement with George Spencer: "Whatever it may cost me, it is, and ever has been my firm intention from the first not to act in opposition to your wishes upon the

subject; and though we never shall be of one opinion respecting it, yet you may rest quite easy in the assurance that I have quite given up the thought of it.'' In several respects her character belied the Hussite and Huguenot extraction her son was at some pains to make out. She was always more ready to conform than to dissent. With the intellectual pursuits of her husband or her son she had little sympathy, and being absolutely sincere she could not pretend to an interest she did not feel. Though she cared little for literature, her style was clear and not wanting in felicities of expression. Evenness and sweetness of temper, conscientiousness in the discharge of duties, readiness to sacrifice herself for others, were lifelong characteristics. In her journal, chapel news and preachers bulk largely. One of the entries would have held good for every Sunday in her grown up life: '' I should not like to miss going to chapel, it would not seem at all like Sunday.'' Although her husband was not wanting in tender solicitude for her, the advent of ill-health and straitened means tended to cloud their domestic happiness. The manifestations of affection were often obscured—on her side by want of sympathy with his intellectual pursuits, on his side by an exacting and censorious attitude.

CHAPTER II

CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH (17 years).

(*April*, 1820—*November*, 1837)

The house in which George Spencer and his wife began their married life, and in which their son first saw the light on April 27, 1820, was 12, Exeter Row, now 27, Exeter Street, the fourth entry from the Exeter Arms. In the baptism and naming of the child his father was not a man to be led by custom. Yet he was alive to the bearing of his non-conforming attitude on the future of his son. When it was suggested by his brother Thomas that the baptism should take place in church, as it might be of importance to the boy hereafter to be in the Parish Register, he wrote: "I almost feel inclined to ask S— [the incumbent of St. Peter's Church] if it would be allowed to register the birth of a child in the Parish Register, without having him baptised. And so to have him baptised at the chapel." The ceremony was performed on June 19 by John Kershaw, birth and baptism being registered at the Methodist Register Office, 66, Paternoster Row, London, on July 1. The name "Herbert" had been suggested by lines written in a churchyard of Richmond, in Yorkshire, by Herbert Knowles, forming the conclusion of an article on "Cemeteries and

---

Note.—*Autobiography*, i., chaps. i., ii., iii., iv., v.

Catacombs in Paris,'' in the *Quarterly Review* for April, 1819.

Of the early years of the boy's life little is known; but one may infer that they were lacking in positive enjoyments. His parents were in ill-health and full of anxiety, nor was he himself robust. He was, moreover, without the companionship of brothers and sisters. For though four brothers and four sisters succeeded him, none of them lived more than a few days, except a sister, Louisa, a year younger than himself, who died at the age of 2 years and 9 months.[1] How depressing the boy's surroundings were may be gathered from his father's letters.

This appears an important crisis in my life (he writes to his brother in 1823). I shall either from this time be tolerably comfortable in my circumstances and health, or else I shall soon be reduced by ill-health to a state of wretchedness bordering on insanity.

January, 1824.—I am still more convinced than ever that I shall never continue healthy with my present employment—the stooping, the confinement, the sameness, the trial of temper and patience that it constantly affords, have a bad effect. . . . Our children were well when we got home. Harriet appears much more happy now that I am better. She is very kind—too kind—and I don't sufficiently return it—it appears to be my temper to expect too much.

The choice of a new occupation, important as a means of livelihood, was even more important as giving him something to think about other than his troubles.

[1] In the *Autobiography* (i., 73, note †) he says there were five other children. This is a mistake. Five were born after Louisa's death and two while she was alive.

No. 27 EXETER STREET, DERBY.

Among the employments suggested were land-surveying, tanning, and an agency in the South of France. Mrs. Mozley urged him to enter the Church. "She thinks I am the most adapted to that of anything." But what he was most inclined to was lace manufacture, for which there was at that time a mania, and which had the further attraction of calling his inventiveness into play. When in London in 1823 inspecting patents, he wrote to his wife: "I shall examine particularly whether there is any machine of the kind you and I are about to invent." What came of this invention does not appear; but in the spring of next year he tells Thomas that he and the other brothers had purchased a machine. "At present we have it in contemplation to convert the schoolroom into a shop for lace frames and learn to work the frames ourselves. . . . I do not intend to teach any more if I can obtain a living in any other way. . . . I have several plans in my head that you may possibly think are visionary, but it is one way I take to keep up my spirits under my heavy trials."

This venture proving a failure, the family moved about the middle of 1824 to Nottingham, mainly on account of its advantages as a centre for the lace industry. Commercially the move was not a success; but in other respects it was beneficial. His own health, as well as that of his wife, improved, and with better health his spirits rose. How it fared with their son the few letters that exist help one little to understand, but the passing references are such as to rouse one's sympathies for the fair-haired, lonely child. Nevertheless, he enjoyed more of a country life than he could have had in Derby, wandering, for the most part by himself, over the neigh-

bouring common.[1] Not being pressed by lessons, he was behind children of his age in book knowledge. At seven his writing and drawing are referred to approvingly by others as well as by his father, who kept his first drawing book, consisting "of drawings of his own choice and chiefly of his own imagination." But nowhere is there the smallest word of praise of his reading.

Early in 1827 the family returned to Derby, settling in the house No. 8 (afterwards 17, now 31) Wilmot Street. His father resumed teaching. For some three years Herbert attended Mr. Mather's school, afterwards going to one kept by his uncle William. Tangible evidences of his attainments are (1) a copybook written in 1828, of which a teacher, whose opinion was invited by the present writer, says, "we can get nothing like it even from boys several years older"; (2) two books—*Hymns for Infant Minds* and Watts' *Divine and Moral Songs*. At the end of each hymn is written the date in 1828 or 1829 when it was committed to memory. From the number thus dated one may infer that his memory was not below the average. The tendency to set authority at nought was more than usually strong: the fitful nature of his father's discipline and the gentleness of his mother's sway exerting no efficient check on his self-will. Out of doors he was allowed to follow his bent—a liberty which on one occasion would have cost him his life but for the presence of mind and courage of George Holme, then a lad some years his senior. Fishing was already a favourite pursuit, the Derwent as it

[1] One of his memoranda says: "Spread Eagle, Aspley Terrace, Alfreton Road, Nottingham—the house (now changed into an inn) where we lived in my childhood."

No. 31 WILMOT STREET, DERBY.

flowed through the town being easy of access. One day, when fishing from the roadway that crossed the stream near the canal and weir, he lost his balance, fell into the stream just where the water rushed out with considerable force from beneath the roadway, and was carried rapidly down. Hearing a shout among the bystanders, George Holme, who was on the other side, looked up and saw a boy being swiftly carried away. Instantly he ran along the right bank, throwing off his jacket as he ran, plunged into the stream and swam across to intercept the struggling boy, whom he seized and with difficulty brought safely to the bank. Thus began an acquaintanceship which in due course ripened into a warm and life-long friendship. On a specially bound copy of his works presented to Mr. Holme in 1893 one may read on the fly-leaf of the first volume the grateful inscription:—

FROM
HERBERT SPENCER
TO HIS OLD FRIEND
GEORGE HOLME
WITHOUT WHOSE COURAGEOUS AID
RENDERED IN BOYHOOD
NEITHER THIS WORK
NOR ANY OF THE ACCOMPANYING WORKS
WOULD EVER HAVE EXISTED.

For the years from seven to thirteen one is dependent mainly on the *Autobiography* and on memoranda by his father. Written late in life, the father's reminiscences could not fail to reflect in some measure the consciousness of the eminence the son had attained to, and Spencer's own recollections could not but be coloured by interpretations derived from subsequent experience. Little progress was made in routine school lessons, yet he ac-

quired an unusual amount of miscellaneous information. When barely eleven he attended Dr. Spurzheim's lectures on Phrenology. Before thirteen he assisted his father in preparing experiments in physics and chemistry for teaching purposes. With insect and plant life he had an acquaintance far in advance of other boys, and was skilled in sketching from Nature. Works of fiction were perused with zest. Left much to himself, the tendency to dwell with his own thoughts was strengthened. On the intellectual side one of the chief results of his father's training was the habit it fostered of ever seeking an explanation of phenomena, instead of relying on authority—of regarding everything as naturally caused, and not as the result of supernatural agency. On the moral side its weakest feature was the encouragement it gave to the inherent tendency of a headstrong boy to set authority at defiance. When taking account of the formative agencies that shaped the boy's character one must bear in mind that he shared little in games with those of his own age, so that the influences which the young are usually subjected to by association with one another were in his case comparatively slight. He was much with grown-up people, most of them of marked individuality. From his reminiscences of his grandparents one may infer that, with one exception, they excited in him a feeling of awe, such as would be a barrier to close and affectionate intercourse. His grandfather Spencer was a "melancholy-looking old man." "I never saw him laugh." In an ordinary boy, the impression produced by the failing faculties or oddities of aged relatives is counteracted by the buoyant, objective spirits of youth. In the case of a thoughtful boy, living mostly

with grown-up people, listening to and taking part in their serious conversation, it is different. As regards the influence, both moral and intellectual, of his uncles and his father, it is hardly possible to overestimate it. Towards current opinions their attitude was invariably critical, their conclusions being reached by reference to underlying principles, not to authority. Rarely were their discussions enlivened by lighter touches of wit or humour. Terribly in earnest, they did not debate for debating's sake or for victory. Literature, history, and fine art concerned them less than scientific, religious, and social questions, which were discussed in the boy's hearing from day to day. Thus early were sown the seeds of that interest in social, political, and religious topics which he retained to the last.

Meanwhile, his education in the scholastic sense was daily becoming a more pressing matter. He was now thirteen; independent and self-willed; with a decided predilection for certain subjects not included in the school curriculum of those days, and a still more decided aversion to certain other subjects then deemed important for every boy to know; fonder of things than words; more inclined to think for himself than to acquaint himself with the thoughts of others. How to deal with such a boy was calculated to rouse serious reflections in the father and the uncles. As Huxley said on reading the account of Spencer's boyhood and youth in the *Autobiography:* "Men of that force of character, if they had been less wise and less self-restrained, would have played the deuce with the abnormal chicken hatched among them."[1]

[1] *Life of Professor Huxley,* ii., 155; *Autobiography,* i., 79-92.

A letter from the parsonage of Hinton Charterhouse suggested a way out of the difficulty. Rev. Thomas Spencer and his wife had " several times wished to have one of our little nephews with us, and as we know you cannot spare Herbert, who is a great help to his mother and a comfort to you both, I have considered little Henry the next one we would like to fix upon." Herbert's parents at once proposed to send him, they taking Henry —" a nice arrangement for all parties " it was thought. The " nice arrangement " was soon to be disturbed. Nothing had been said about it to Herbert, who accompanied his parents on what he thought was a pleasant holiday. A few days after his arrival his uncle set him to learn Euclid. That was bad enough. But when, about a month later, he was told that he was not to return home with his parents, his feelings were very bitter. Accustomed as he had been to take part in the discussion of family affairs, here was a matter in which he had the best right to take part, settled two months ago without his knowledge! Distaste for study and dislike to restraint, both pretty strong feelings, had a powerful ally in this sense of unfair treatment. The consequences were soon to appear. Early one morning, within two weeks of his parents' return, without a hint of his intention, he left the house and set out for Derby. Of his adventures on that and the two following days—graphically depicted by himself in the *Autobiography* (i., 106-109)—many will share the opinion expressed by Mr. Francis Galton: " Great as is the wonder and admiration excited by your later achievements, they hardly exceed that I felt at the account of the thirteen-year-old boy, when heart sick and starving, walking 48 miles on

one day, 47 on the next, and the balance of the distance to be travelled on the third. It is marvellous.''

No attempt was made by uncle or aunt to overtake the run-away—a neglect explained though not justified by the indignation felt at the insult he had heaped upon them. His mother was '' ashamed and mortified at Herbert's misconduct,'' and his father passed '' the whole of the night without sleep, ruminating on the character and prospects of my untoward son.'' Both tried to enlist the sympathies of the uncle and aunt on behalf of the boy, who '' seemed almost distracted.''

I asked him (wrote his father), how he could act so unkindly to you. . . . He replied '' I know it is very wrong, but I felt as I could not help it ''; or else, '' all the way that I was coming, I kept on crying and thinking what would become of me.'' '' I am sure,'' says he, with much emphasis, '' I don't know what will become of me. . . . I know my uncle and aunt wish me well and I should have many advantages in my learning if I had stopped. But everything is so different. I can't bear it, and if you will but let me stop at home I mean to work harder than I ever did before.'' '' But,'' said I, '' you know your uncle understands Latin much better than I do, and that is very desirable for you.'' '' Aye, it was the Latin that made me think so of home, for I thought I should never be able to bear staying in my bedroom by myself all the winter studying my Latin Grammar. It was different with my Geometry, I was beginning to be very fond of Euclid. . . . Everything is so different, I never knew what home was till now, and if you will only try me I'll be a very different boy from what I was before I went.''

Within a fortnight he was again at Hinton. '' His manner ever since his arrival,'' his uncle wrote, '' has

been particularly pleasing. There is a quietness about him and an evident desire to be satisfied.'' About Latin he tells his father: '' You will perhaps be surprised when I tell you that I begin to like it better.'' French was taken up with the New Year, and Greek in March. That he had no aptitude for the classics, but studied them from a sense of duty, is shown by a letter to his uncle during a visit home in the autumn. '' As I now see that the dead languages are so useful in almost every science, I have made a determination to conquer them if possible.'' Notwithstanding this determination, the task was eventually given up as hopeless.

The importance of a correct, clear, and forcible style was frequently touched upon in letters from his father. Yet it is surprising how little stress was laid by either father or uncle on general reading. His letters, though not unfrequently marred by mis-spelling, faulty grammar, and hasty composition, are, nevertheless, in both matter and form, remarkable productions for a boy of from thirteen to sixteen. '' You said in your last letter you would have sent me a list of the words I spelt wrong, only that you thought it would be unwelcome; do not think so, as I am very desirous of improving in my spelling.'' Not that his father was remiss in fault-finding, for he was a constant and unsparing critic. Shortly after the run-away adventure, Algebra had been taken up with zest. Presently his uncle wrote: '' His talents for Mathematics, I should say, are of a very high order.'' For Trigonometry he expressed '' delight,'' '' for that is my feeling towards it.'' The sixth book of Euclid he did not like so well as the first four books, '' because I do not think the demonstrations are so palpable as in

those books." As for arithmetic " I am principally deficient in the rudimental parts; and as it will be a great inconvenience to me if ever I become a teacher to be deficient in those parts, I intend to practise these when I have convenient opportunities." Under his father's guidance he began Perspective, and " was much surprised to find that the principle was so very simple, and the only difficulty that I have yet had is in the application of this principle, which requires to be different in almost every problem, which will be a very good thing to rouse the powers of invention, which in me are rather dormant." Early in May, 1835, he had said: " I am able to do problems much better than equations for two reasons: first, because I take a greater interest in problems as being something that requires ingenuity and not merely mechanical exertion of the mind; and secondly, because in problems there are seldom such complicated equations as those that are given as equations."

" Be sure to place the *art of sketching from nature* first " was his father's repeated advice. In 1834 he made a sketch of his uncle's house, in which he thought he had " succeeded pretty well." A year later he sent home a plan of the parsonage and grounds, " as I think it may be pleasing to my grandmother and amusing to Henry [whom he was wont to call ' the usurper ' for having taken his place], and perhaps improving to myself."

From home he wrote to his uncle in the autumn of 1835:

Since I wrote you I have been chiefly studying chemistry. . . . I found the subject of crystallisation very

interesting indeed. Since I have been at home I have had many interesting discussions with my father on natural and moral philosophy. On one occasion I asked him his opinion on that subject which we were discussing one day at Hinton, I mean the theory of friction in some instances being caused by attraction.

The time not given up to mental improvement was occupied by pursuits, few of which could be called recreations. Though not insensible to its value, his uncle's view of life was too serious to leave much room for play as now understood. The future preacher of the gospel of relaxation was brought up to seek relaxation in doing something useful. And, indeed, he was always ready to work in the garden or in the house. In painting the gates his "everyday clothes were so soiled that my uncle has purchased me another pair, the jacket and waistcoat of which are of middling priced blue cloth and the trousers of corduroy." Here was a chance for his father. "There was an expresion in your letter 'a pair of clothes' we thought remarkable. What should it have been?" With the household he identified himself. Certain alterations in the house "we" found to be great improvements. "We have been very busy buying and distributing the clothes for the clothing club, so that I have hardly any time to myself." Opportunities for fishing or riding were seldom missed. "I have been learning to skait, and although I have not skaited more than seven hours I have made great progress and shall soon be able to skait well; indeed, my uncle says I ought to do so as you were so good a skaiter." His uncle bought him a pair of quoits. "But I hope it will be, as I feel it ought to be, my great aim to sacrifice the pleas-

ure of playing with them when I can be of any use to you."

His temperament brought him into frequent collision with those about him. His deep-seated disregard of authority was held in check by the strong rule of his uncle, who wrote towards the close of 1833: "His conduct the last few months is quite changed from what it was formerly; he is quite tractable, and I have scarcely seen an instance of bad temper showing itself for a long time." Again: "My authority over him is great and I am quite satisfied with his obedience to me, but I fear he would not submit himself in like manner to any other person." During his uncle's frequent absences from home he was apt to become "very unmanagable." Just before he left Hinton his uncle wrote: "There is a more becoming deference to the opinions of others. . . . A residence with his mother will soon bring back the self-will which marked his character so strongly when he came here. . . . He must part with some of his confidence in his own judgment."

Confidence in his own judgment—the other side of his disregard for authority—was apt to show itself in a dictatorial tone towards other young people; not accompanied, however, by any desire to tyrannise over them. Had he been sent to a large school, this feature would have been toned down; the application of a wider standard to his own achievements would have diminished his superabundant self-confidence. Satisfaction with himself is shown in the early stages of almost every new acquirement. He prided himself on his rapidly acquired proficiency in skating. As for chess, "I am become so skilful as to sometimes beat my uncle with an equal num-

ber of pieces." "I have now become acquainted with all the etiquette of dinner parties, having been at five or six large ones since I came here." Soon after taking up Trigonometry he wrote: "I believe I am now thoroughly master of it, and I could do any question in it." He needed his father's reminder: "Your faults arise from too high an opinion of your own attainments." This self-confidence was the natural accompaniment of a powerful intellect working freely. When a mind of remarkable originality is set to acquire knowledge at fixed times and in accordance with prescribed methods, not only is the result often meagre and the exercise distasteful, but confidence in itself is liable to be shaken. And, indeed, now and again we do meet with a diffidence contrasting strangely with his wonted complacency.

I have been very much concerned lately at finding myself so liable to forget what I have learned, and have often tried to account for it, but have never been able. My father says it is because I do not sufficiently live in the subject, as he expresses it; that is, that I do not continually employ my mind in thinking upon what I have learnt; and I begin to think that he is right.

Again: I intend to apply to my studies with greater vigour than I have yet done, and I hope my resolution will not fail me. I think that a great obstacle to my getting on fast is a want of a certain degree of energy in pursuing my studies, and I hope that when I have overcome my repugnance to hard study I shall be able to become in most respects what you and my father desire.

And in 1836: I have not yet been able to overcome that feeling that I was mentioning in my last letter of an inability to apply myself diligently to any subject; I do not seem to have strength of mind enough to over-

come my idle inclinations, and I begin to be fearful that I shall forget a great part of what I have learned.

To this want of energy he often recurs, confessing himself "at a loss to account for it." His good intentions are quaintly expressed in some of his letters during 1833 and 1834, in which he subscribes himself "Your intended obedient son," or "Your affectionate and improving son." Too much both morally and intellectually was expected of a boy of from thirteen to sixteen, and too little account was taken of his striking individuality, but for which he could not have held his own against the superabundance of exhortation and advice to which, in season and out of season, he was subjected.

Writing about his own father Sir Leslie Stephen says[1]: "My father's fine taste and his sensitive nature made him tremblingly alive to one risk. He shrunk from giving us any inducement to lay bare our own religious emotions. To him and to our mother the needless revelation of the deeper feelings seemed to be a kind of spiritual indelicacy." Not so Herbert Spencer's father. To earnest entreaties that he would lay bare his innermost feelings, Herbert was far from being responsive; but in one letter (October, 1833) he expresses gratitude for his father's solicitude. "I can only attribute it to his sincere desire for my welfare, of which I am convinced from the good advice given, and hope with the help of the Almighty to follow it." Such a response went to his mother's heart. His father wished to know "the reigning principle" that caused him to behave well during his uncle's absence at Christmas, of the

[1] *Life of Sir Fitz-James Stephen*, p. 62.

same year. "I hope you will examine yourself closely and tell me without reserve what the motive was." Herbert's reply is not forthcoming, but in a letter from his father mention is made of it and of the pleasure it gave to his sick mother. In February, 1835, after insisting on "the great necessity of examining the nature and state of your own mind," his father appears to lose patience with his son's reticence. "Talk to me upon these subjects, either say that you can or you can not understand what I mean." To this he replies:

You ask me whether I can understand the feelings of returning life and apply them to my own case which you mention. I can, and I see that it applies very well to my case; but, however, I must conclude, as I have not much more time, and I will tell you more about my feelings in my next.

P.S.—Send me word how you like Dash, and whether you perceive the faculties in him that you expected.

His "next," (at any rate the next letter that has been preserved) not having given the promised account of his "feelings," his father expresses dissatisfaction. "I don't think so well of your letter-writing as I did. I hope in your next you will answer all the questions that you are behind. You have now had abundance of time." His reluctance to unbosom himself on religious matters was not due to lack of affection for and confidence in his parents. Except religion, which few boys care to expatiate upon, there was no subject which he did not write about in the frankest manner. In the sayings and doings of his parents he ever took a lively interest. "I was very much pleased," he wrote to his father, "when I received your letter, and still more so

when I read the news it contained, and I am very anxious to hear whether this little sister of mine is still alive and is likely to continue with us, and also to know how my mother is going on." When the baby died he expressed his sorrow, both on his parents' account and on his own. "I should be much delighted to have had a little sister to amuse when I came home."

Towards the end of 1835 he made his earliest attempt to write for the press. His description of his feelings on first seeing himself in print may be compared with what he wrote sixty years later on completing the *Synthetic Philosophy*.[1]

To his Father.

January, 1836.

But now for the subject that has been so much engrossing my mind of late; you must know that what with my uncle writing his pamphlet, and articles in the newspapers, &c., &c., I began to think of trying my hand at writing something. Just at this juncture a new magazine[2] was started. . . . After some consideration I sent *an article* on those little boats which we discovered when I was trying to crystallise salt. I did not tell this to my uncle and aunt for fear that *my article* would not appear in the magazine, but now it is published, and after a little search as soon as I could get hold of the magazine, I found *my article* looking very pretty. You may imagine my delight when I first saw it. I began shouting and capering about the room until my uncle and aunt did not know what was amiss; but they were very much surprised and pleased when I showed them *my* article. . . . And now that I have started I intend to go on writing things for this magazine now and then,

[1] *Principles of Sociology*, iii., preface dated August, 1896.

[2] *The Bath and West of England Magazine*, started in January, 1836.

and in the next number will be my second attempt. In this same number that mine was in there was a very ignorant and prejudiced article on the Poor Laws, which I intend to reply to. I suppose I shall be getting quite proud very soon; indeed upon reading the above over I find that it savours a good deal of it, but I must try to strive against it as well as I can.

In his letter on the Poor Laws, which appeared in the March number, he says of the " very ignorant and prejudiced article ":

There are many assertions without a proof; these I pass over; but there are also assertions directly opposed to the truth of Scripture, and to these I shall briefly allude. . . . The whole system of Man's responsibility, and of his future reward or punishment, depending upon his being " diligent in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord," seems completely set aside by your reasoning.

He was getting anxious to return home and had written about it in a way his father did not like, as being discourteous to his uncle. " I think you must have misunderstood my letter and have thought that I meant more than I did; all I did mean in what I had written was that as I should have my time more at my own disposal, it would be better for me to be at home. I own that in some parts I said stronger things than I ought to have done, and that on the whole I made the thing appear more than it really was, and I am very sorry for it."

Reaching home about the middle of 1836, he lost no time in settling down to regular study, mainly in arithmetic, hand-writing, and composition. He was now be-

tween sixteen and seventeen, and the choice of a profession was becoming a matter of urgency. This had often been talked about during the preceding three years. As early as March, 1834, he had written to his father: "Aunt has been thinking that the medical profession would suit me as well as anything, and as to myself, either that or following in your steps would be what I should prefer. . . . Send me your opinion, which would be the best of the two, in your next letter." His uncle William strongly favoured teaching. His father's reply showed the characteristic want of decision when face to face with an important practical question. "After all it is a subject that more immediately concerns yourself than any one else. . . . It is a difficult question, and one which should not hastily be answered." It was not hastily answered—remained, in fact, unanswered when he left Hinton for good. Shortly after he went home a friend suggested engineering, about which he wrote to his father, then absent on holiday: "I had not thought of it before, but since I have thought of it [I] think it would be a very eligible profession for me . . . since it is just the kind of thing for which my past studies have fitted me." He had to wait sixteen months before the opportunity arose for giving effect to the suggestion. Meanwhile, in accordance with his father's wishes, he assisted in his uncle William's school, and afterwards in that of Mr. Mather. In the *Autobiography* (i., 140-141) he discusses the probability of success or of failure had he taken to teaching. From the fact that he heads the chapter "A False Start" it may be gathered that he did not think success very probable.

CHAPTER III

ENGINEERING

(*November,* 1837—*April,* 1841)

Spencer had not been long on the staff of the London and Birmingham Railway, which he joined in November, 1837, before he showed that he was not to be an unthinking follower of routine. "An improvement in the colouring of the drawings of cast-iron," is mentioned in an early letter home. Within a few months he was put in charge of the approaches to the Harrow Road bridge, with about eighty men under him. It is interesting to note how, after experience in the measurement of brickwork at this bridge, the future opponent of the metric system resolved "to have a foot-rule made divided into decimals instead of into inches." "I am trying to bring decimal arithmetic into use as much as possible." What spare time he had was not idled away. "I always find myself much more comfortable and my head much clearer when I have spent part of the day in studying mathematics, so that I have made it an invariable rule lately to employ part of my time each day in that way."

His ability and conscientiousness, joined to the long-standing friendship between the Fox and Spencer families, stood him in good stead when the construction staff

---

Note.—*Autobiography,* i., chaps. vi., vii., viii., ix.

came to be reduced. He was offered an appointment on the Gloucester and Birmingham Railway. "The advantages of my new situation would be increased salary, great chance of promotion, having a good master to serve, and, to crown all, Mr. Fox says, if I do not like it I may come back to him. I want to have your opinion and advice about it; write as soon as possible." As usual, his father shirked the responsibility on the plea of being busy, leaving his uncle William to send a reply, which was in favour of acceptance. When he entered upon his duties at Worcester in September, 1838, he was exercised about the wisdom of the step he had taken. "Do I stand the best chance with a downright clever man like Mr. Fox or with one more in the common way, as I understand Captain Moorsom to be?" Though annoyed to find "that, if there is much work to be done in a short time, we are obliged to remain till late in the evening," yet "the more I see of engineering the more I like it; no other profession would have suited me so well." His old drawings seemed "very rubbishing things now: I should be quite ashamed to show them as my drawings." "I believe I am considered the neatest draughtsman in the staff, though perhaps not the quickest." "We have had a controversy in the office of which I was the origin, about the proper form of a shadow," in a given case. Controversies were likely to arise among officers one of whom was so intellectually keen, so wanting in reticence, and so argumentative as Spencer. Mr. Mosse, perhaps in 1904 the only survivor of those who served with him at Worcester, writes to me: "For some eighteen months I worked with him at the *same table*. . . . Spencer's office comrades found him an agreeable man, though we

thought him a little bumptious, and we chaffed him somewhat on his forthcoming book." The world presented too many serious questions to his active mind to allow of interest being taken in the frivolities of his brother officers. Discussions with his father were among his greatest pleasures, full advantage being taken of every opportunity. As if in revenge for the way he had been badgered in the Hinton days, he again and again calls his father to account for not answering his questions. His letters home were full of reflections on the problems of scientific, professional, or human interest that occupied his thoughts. "I do not know what my mother will say to such a mathematical letter as this," was a remark he might have made regarding more letters than one.

To his Father.

19 *January,* 1839.

I have found out the grand principle of the projection of shadows. . . . I feel almost certain of its correctness. To make myself still more satisfied I have made a model in pasteboard and I find that the real shadow is as exactly as possible what I had made it by projection.

18 *November,* 1839.—The last drawing I have made was one for a double swing bridge of about 50 feet span from centre to centre of turnplate. . . . You may imagine that I had some difficulty in constructing it in such a manner that the two sides should remain in equilibrium on their centres; I discovered, however, a very simple and satisfactory mode of doing it which I will explain to you at Christmas. I am just about to commence another drawbridge, which is to be upon the lifting instead of the swinging plan.

4 *March,* 1840.—I am going on swimmingly with this affair of the Worcester bridge; some time after I had finished the rough drawing from the measurements I took, I received Captain Moorsom's directions to get out drawings after a certain design of his own. I, not exactly liking this plan of his and thinking that a much stronger and more economical might be adopted, was so bold as to write to him and propose a plan of my own. I rather expected that he might be angry at my being so impertinent, but, however, he took it very kindly and seems almost to prefer my plan to his own; at any rate he has desired me to get out drawings for both plans and leave it to be subsequently decided which is to be adopted.

Captain Moorsom had asked his opinion on a design for protecting the retaining wall of the old castle of Shrewsbury. This "I pretty much approved of, not seeing any better method with the same outlay of money. This evening, however, I was strolling along the banks of the Teme, making sundry observations on the effects of the stream under various circumstances, and, noting all the phenomena with the *eye of an engineer,* it struck me in connection with some of the results I then came to that a more efficient and I believe a more economical plan might be adopted in the case of Shrewsbury." Captain Moorsom, however, liked his own plan better and set Spencer to write a specification for it. "This was the first thing of the kind I had ever done, and I had no data to go by, so that I was left entirely to my own resources (just what I like)."

Towards official superiors, not less than towards fellow-officers, his critical attitude exhibited itself. Their professional ability "elicits but little praise from me or from any one who is behind the scenes." On more than

one occasion he mentions what he sarcastically calls, "a pretty bit of engineering," due, as he points out, to miscalculation or to ignorance of physical principles. His scrupulous conscientiousness made it impossible for him to take things easily. On being sent to complete sundry works that had been left undone, he tells his father: "I do not expect to have a very pleasant time of it; taking up other people's jobs is not the pleasantest thing in the world. I hear that there is a great deal to do, and if I find that there is more than I can manage or that the confusion makes me over-anxious (as I think it very likely will) I shall give it up." His anxiety in connection with the rebuilding of the bridge carrying the railway over the river Avon at Defford gave rise to the nickname "Defford" being given him by his brother officers.

"My inventive faculties," he tells his father in May, 1840, "are considerably on the increase. I have two very nice little contrivances to explain to you." One of these was called the "Velocimeter," the other the "Dynamometer"—the former for measuring the velocity and the latter for measuring the tractive force of an engine. In November he writes: "I have just invented another little instrument. . . . It is another application of that grand principle of similar triangles which I seem to be rather felicitous in making use of. The object is to reduce any quantities of one denomination to the equivalent values in another."[1] Another matter to which his inventive powers were directed was an application of electro-magnetism his father had thought of. In May, 1840, he writes: "If I have not a

[1] *Autobiography*, i., Appendix D, p. 613.

prospect of a good berth when my present engagement expires, I think it would be worth while to set about it in earnest.'' In sacrificing railway engineering for this he was of opinion that there was '' very little to lose, and *a great prospect* of a great gain.'' Early in 1841 he busied himself with the apparatus for the experiment, his father urging secrecy.

For Art he had little time, but in October, 1840, he writes: '' Do you know that I have been attempting to take profiles lately, and with much greater success than I expected.'' Again: '' You may laugh at my taking profiles, but I can assure you that I have had considerable success.''

Writing for the press was in abeyance. Soon after joining Mr. Fox's office, to an enquiry from his father whether he had sent anything to the *Mechanic's Magazine* he replied: '' I have had my attention so much drawn off by other things that I had never thought of it until you mentioned it in your letter. Since then I have turned the thing over in my mind, and I think, with your approval, I shall send an account of a little discovery I have made since I have been in London.'' The account of the '' little discovery '' was not sent, however; and, indeed, by 1840 he had come to think the pages of the *Mechanic's Magazine* hardly suitable for the contributions of a promising young engineer. '' I do not half like the *Mechanic's Magazine;* for although it may contain some good things it has also the universal character of publishing a considerable portion of trash, which practically deducts from the credit of the sensible articles.'' Besides an article on '' Skew Arches '' in the *Civil Engineer and Architect's Journal* for May, 1839,

there was one on a "Geometrical Theorem," in the same journal for July, 1840.

His health, although occupying more of his thoughts than is usual with young men, was, on the whole, satisfactory. The interaction of body and mind is already a frequent topic. Thus, after a spell of hard work: "The effect of the over-exertion showed itself in depression of spirits and a constant feeling of dissatisfaction with myself, and a more than usual repetition of the fear (which I have occasionally felt for the last four or five years) that my mind was not so vigorous and acute, nor my memory so retentive as it once was." Early in 1840 he is convinced that increase in weight "is the cause of my having been so stupid for the last half year."

This self-depreciation is difficult to reconcile with the self-confidence he usually showed. His Dynamometer "would leave Dr. Lardner and his experiments quite in the back ground." "I don't know what Carr's is, but I can back mine for accuracy and convenience." Of his essay on the setting out of curves, read to the Engineers' Club, he flattered himself that "it was one of the most complete papers that has been read since the institution has been originated."[1] Again: "I believe that had I a little more knowledge of the general routine of business, I should be able to manage the resident engineership quite as efficiently as is done in either of the divisions of this line."

To his Father.

11 *March*, 1839.

Do you know I have lately observed that in many of those things in which you always said I was deficient I

[1] Compare *Autobiography*, i., 173.

am rather superior to others; for instance, you always thought I explained my ideas badly, but whenever any in the office want to have anything made clear to them they come to me because they say they can understand me best.

15 *April,* 1840.—Notwithstanding I am progressing on the whole pretty prosperously, I do not feel entirely satisfied with myself. I know that I might have made better use of my time in the way of study and that there have been many opportunities of improvement or of gaining information that I have let slip; and the worst part of it is that this feeling of dissatisfaction that I allude to does not seem to produce any beneficial effect.

18 *January,* 1841.—How often I wish now that I had made more diligent use of my former opportunities of acquiring information. Comparatively little is to be done after once entering into active life. The fatigue of body and mind and want of energy generally unfit for study even [in] the leisure moments. It is a great pity that a just estimate of the value of knowledge is only made after the means of gaining it are lost. I have about come to the conclusion that it is better that studies should be completed before entering the world, and let such entrance be made later, rather than leave much to be learned afterwards.

5 *April,* 1841.—My mind has been for some time past in a torpid condition, and I am looking forward to the time when I shall shake off the feeling by a vigorous course of study.

This self-depreciation does not reflect the estimate in which he was held by those with whom he worked. Captain Moorsom's opinion was given in a letter to his

father, dated 31st May, 1840, across a copy of which Spencer has pencilled: "I have sought in vain for the original of this letter among my father's papers."[1]

Your son Herbert has . . . been well brought up, which he owes, I presume, to you, and he seems likely to make proper use of the advantage and to carry it on by carefully improving himself as he proceeds in life. He has a quick but clear and decided way of grappling with his subject so as to get the precise points carefully, and then he does not lack ability or energy to carry this subject out to its result. . . . I trust you will write to him to keep him in mind that all these matters are but secondary to the great object here, namely the provision for an endless life. . . . Herbert's domestic and gentlemanly habits appear to remove him from many temptations, and I hope the temptation of a mind trusting *on its own* strength will not be allowed to assail him.

In his father's letters during this period religious exhortation does not bulk so largely as during the Hinton period. Ready to discuss religion as a general question, Spencer continued to be proof against appeals to write about his own spiritual condition. And while there is no lack of evidence that he was inspired by a high moral ideal and endeavoured to realise the serious purport of life, there is nothing to indicate that he looked to any of the creeds for his moral standard, or to the religious emotions for the moral sanction. During his first year at Worcester he also eschewed political discussion, partly because it interfered with his work and partly because he was "quite satisfied that whatever temporary stoppages there may be in the progress of Reform, we shall continually advance towards a better state." That

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 185.

there were natural processes of rectification in society, was already an idea familiar to him. When, at about the age of twenty, he did take up religion and politics, his treatment of them was marked by the same disregard of convention and the same desire to get at fundamental principles as was his treatment of scientific and professional matters. His opinions are to be gathered only indirectly—from letters written by his friends, in reply to letters of his which, unfortunately, were not preserved. His views about an over-ruling Providence may be inferred from the letter from Miss —— printed in the *Autobiography* (i., 169). E. A. B—— chaffs him as to the failure of his theories of life to help him to face with equanimity the worries incident to his profession. "I am, however, very glad to find that you are not yet become quite a misanthrope in addition to your turn for hypochondriacism."

How he came to interest himself in political, social, and religious questions in 1840 can only be conjectured. In some respects it may be called a revival of an interest awakened during his boyhood at home, and kept alive at Hinton. As his prospects in engineering declined, the hereditary interest in man and society re-asserted itself; and during the last year on the railway, he was constantly discussing these questions with his brother officers and friends. It was in vain that Captain Moorsom hoped that a troublesome bit of work he had set him would do him good "by taking some of the philosophy out of him." The social and political state of the country afforded ample food for reflection. The "few remarks on education," which he wished to make public, referred, probably, to the scope and aim of education

rather than to its machinery; but the increase in the Education grant and the formation of the Committee of the Privy Council, turned his attention to the relation of education to the State. In ecclesiastical matters his Nonconformist instincts and training led him to watch, here with sympathy and there with disapproval, the movements which were convulsing the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, as well as the measures proposed for dealing with ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland.

Conscious of the family failing, his father was ever warning him against outspoken opinionativeness. When the three months' notice of the termination of his engagement was received in January, 1841, it was entered in his diary: "Got the sack—very glad." In such a mood he curtly declined an offer of a permanent appointment in the locomotive service. "I refused it . . . without asking what it was"—a remark which called forth reproof from his father for his want of good manners. In these later months a change had come over his feelings towards his chief, from whom he had received much kindness, and with whom he had been on excellent terms. This was a matter of much concern to his parents, and Spencer himself in after life regretted it.[1] The fact was that the set-back in railway enterprise injuriously affected the whole staff, and it was characteristic that he should espouse the cause of his brother officers as eagerly as if the evil had befallen himself. That he personally had little or no ground for complaint is clear from the following extract from a letter asking for a testimonial:—

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 178-183, 185, 211.

To Captain Moorsom.

Worcester, 24 *April*, 1841.

I beg to express my sincere thanks for the uniform kindness, and consideration for my welfare, with which you have always treated me—and if at any time I have not appeared sufficiently sensible of your good wishes, I hope you will ascribe it [rather] to the want of facility of expression than to the absence of the proper feeling. I shall consider myself very fortunate if in after life I meet with so much disinterested attention to my prosperity and happiness as I have experienced during my service under you.

His circle of acquaintances was small, hardly going beyond his brother officers, with only three or four of whom he formed a friendship. Of lady friends he may be said to have had none until he met Mrs. Moorsom. He has told us in the *Autobiography* (i., 191-194) how, with the advent of a niece of Captain Moorsom's there came "an experience which was quite new to" him. Writing to her after his return to Derby, he says:—

Accept my thanks for the great kindness and good will that you have shown me during the term of our acquaintance, and believe me when I say that I shall always continue to look back upon the friendship you have shown to me as an honour, and upon the time that I have spent in your society with a mixture of pleasure and regret.

In spite of his argumentativeness, his unsparing criticisms, and the unpalatable nature of some of his opinions, his "domestic and gentlemanly habits"—to use an expression of Captain Moorsom's—secured him the esteem of those who knew him intimately. If not very ready to make new friends, he did not for light rea-

sons cast off the old. He was not made to be alone. Left to himself at Harrow in 1838 he came to the conclusion that he would "never do for a hermit." At Worcester his spirits were "apt to get low for want of society," and he often felt "a longing for a little stirring life." While he lived at Powick it was different. With Captain and Mrs. Moorsom's children he was a great favourite. "Since I have been at Powick I have proved the truth of that maxim 'the way to the mother's heart is through her children'; for, in consequence, I believe, of my being a favourite with the Captain's little ones, I have become so with Mrs. Moorsom." At no previous period had there been any opportunity of revealing that fondness for children which remained with him through life. Like the author of *Alice in Wonderland,* he was fonder of girls than of boys.

He returned home in time for his 21st birthday. Since he left it three and a half years before he had gone through a variety of experiences, which had not been lost upon him. His character had developed in numerous ways. He had secured a grasp of mathematical and physical principles, his inventive powers had enjoyed scope for exercise, he had gained a fair knowledge of certain branches of engineering and an acquaintance with the routine of important undertakings, had become accustomed to the management of men, and learnt business habits which could not fail to be useful. His official duties had cultivated his power of consecutive thinking and given him fluency and directness of composition. While affording him opportunities for theoretical speculation, his work did not divorce him from practical interests. On the contrary, it fostered

that power of uniting abstract thought with concrete exemplification and illustration so noticeable in his books. Several stages of mental growth had yet to be gone through before he would be qualified to enter upon his life's work; but already the main features of his intellectual and moral character had begun to develop and the faint outlines of a few of his most pregnant ideas had appeared amid much that was yet in a chaotic condition. How the change came about from his lack of interest in social, political and religious questions in 1839 to his absorption in them in the latter part of 1840 and the spring of 1841, does not appear. It may be that, like Cobden, his character widened and ripened quickly. Perhaps it would be too much to say that " we pass at a single step from the natural and wholesome egotism of the young man who has his bread to win, to the wide interests and generous public spirit of the good citizen ";[1] but it is clear that a change did take place which was to alter the whole course of his life.

[1] Morley's *Life of Cobden*, i., 25.

CHAPTER IV

LITERATURE WOOED BUT NOT WON

(*April*, 1841—*December*, 1844)

When he left Worcester in the spring of 1841, Spencer had no fixed intention of giving up engineering. His immediate purpose was to assist his father in the electro-magnetic invention which was to pave the way to fortune, but which had presently to be abandoned as unworkable. To literature he was not drawn by its inherent attractiveness. Rather he was urged towards it by the need of finding utterance for a ferment of ideas "upon the state of the world and religion," his interest in which, favoured by leisure and congenial surroundings, gathered strength after his return home. His uncle Thomas was in the full tide of his reforming propaganda; and whatever energy his father could spare was devoted to work of public moment. The economical condition of the country was deplorable, and the ecclesiastical atmosphere was charged with the elements of violent disturbance. And all the time that influences were thus drawing him aside from engineering, the check to railway enterprise was rendering that profession less and less attractive.

For guidance in his studies he had drawn up a "daily appropriation of time." "Rise at 5; out tak-

Note.—*Autobiography*, i., chaps. x., xi., xii., xiv., xv.

ing exercise from 6 to 8; sketching or any like occupation till breakfast; mathematics from 9 to 1; electro-magnetic experiments, 2 to 3; geometrical drawing, 3 to 4; French, 4 to 6; walking out, 6 to 7; tea and conversation on some fixed subject, 7 to 8; reading history or natural philosophy, 8 to 9; writing out diary, 9 to 10.30." This was an ideal scheme, rarely, if ever, carried out in full. The electro-magnetic experiments, for example, almost ceased on the failure of the machine which was to work such wonders. Experiments in electrotyping and electro-chemistry were continued into the following year. At first promising, they led to nothing. Besides mathematics, geology and natural science were studied more or less fitfully. Neatly executed pen and ink drawings of some fifty different forms of leaves bear witness to his interest in botany. Carpentry, French, sketching (mostly portraiture), glee-singing, boating (generally in company with his newly-acquired friend, Mr. Lott), and fishing, were among his lighter pursuits. The portraits of Mr. Holme, Mrs. Ordish, and Mr. Lott bear witness to his skill with the pencil. His design for an economical bridge was elaborated into an article "On a new form of Viaduct." Of the article "On the Transverse Strain of Beams," his friend Jackson said: "I confess that your paper, with 'Herbert Spencer, C.E.' at the head of it, almost paralysed me with emotion; your strides are so gigantic that they leave me far behind." As to the letters "C.E.," which do not appear in Spencer's manuscript but were inserted by the editor, E. A. B—— wrote: "I was very glad to get your explanation of the 'C.E.' in the *Engineer's Journal,* for on reading it I remarked, 'What a fool Spencer has grown'!" To

guard against a repetition of the mistake Spencer told the editor: "I should prefer my name appearing in future without any professional distinction, although I have perhaps much better claim to the title of civil engineer than many who make use of it." Ambitious attempts were made in architectural design, displaying in Mr. Jackson's opinion "inventive genius rather than judicious, well-informed taste." In a paper on "Architectural Precedent," in the *Civil Engineer and Architect's Journal*, for January, 1842, "Veneration for antiquity," is described as "one of the greatest obstacles, not only to the advancement of architecture, but to the progress of every species of improvement." The cause "exists in the present system of classical education." In the July issue of the same journal appeared his paper on the "Velocimeter."[1]

Into the social, political and religious discussions of the day he threw himself with a fearless courage and a radical thoroughness characteristic of a powerful theorising intellect untrammelled by considerations of expediency. From the letters of his friends Jackson and E. A. B—— one gathers that he was in favour "of abolishing the forms of baptism, the sacrament, ordination, &c., &c., as being unsuited to the times we live in now, and as having been only intended for the people to whom they were immediately addressed." One learns also that he was dissatisfied with the political situation—the interests of the monarch being "not those of the people," and the aristocracy being able to "frustrate all the attempts of the people to administer justice." A communication criticising the clergy of the Church of England

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 609, Appendix C.



GEORGE HOLME.

From a sketch made by Herbert Spencer about 1842.

draws from E. A. B—— the retort: "I never in all my life read such a tirade of scurrilous abuse." Spencer had been roused to anger by the unscrupulous attacks on his uncle Thomas, some of the calumnies having been retailed in a letter from E. A. B——. He was accustomed to plain speaking from his two friends, and their criticisms never offended him, however unpalatable. "You talk," wrote E. A. B—— "of your power of writing a long letter with very little material; but that is a mere trifle to your facility for building up a formidable theory on precious slight foundations." Their verdict on the phrenological examination of his head was probably what he looked for; and if not then, yet later, he would have admitted that "the 5s. might have been better spent." E. A. B.——'s characterisation of him as "radical all over" was no exaggeration. His non-conformity in dress comes out in a letter to Miss —— (January, 1842).

Having patiently persisted in patronising the practice of cap-wearing, notwithstanding the surprise exhibited by the good people of Derby at such an outrageous piece of independence and the danger of being mistaken for a Chartist leader, as I have frequently been, I have at last had the gratification of witnessing the result of my good example in the adoption of the cap as a head-dress by a good number of the young men of Derby. So that it appears that I may actually claim the high honour of *setting the fashion.*

During a visit to Hinton in May and June, 1842, he began the series of letters to the *Nonconformist* "On the Proper Sphere of Government." However significant these letters may be in relation to his future work—how-

ever true it may be that the reception accorded them strengthened the pre-existing inclination to abandon engineering for literature—they did not in the smallest degree help to answer the question of how to make a living. A momentary gleam of hope came from a proposal to enlarge the *Nonconformist,* as well as to bring out a new periodical under the auspices of the Complete Suffrage Union, of which Mr. Joseph Sturge was at that time one of the leading spirits. The starting of a periodical on his own account was also thought of, but Mr. Sturge urged caution. Encouraged by his uncle Thomas and his father he identified himself with most of the reform movements of the day. One of these was the abolition of bribery at elections. Among his contributions there is an "Address to the Magistrates of Derby," also two drafts of an "Anti-bribery Declaration" both dated September 24, 1843. The one is put into the mouth of the Aldermen and Town Councillors of the Borough of Derby; the other is a declaration of the individual voter in parliamentary, municipal or other elections. Another product of his pen was "An Address from the Municipal Electors of the Borough of Derby to the Authorities of the Town," signed by 600 electors, protesting against the alleged interference of the magistrates in preventing a meeting advertised to be held in the theatre to hear a lecture by Mr. Henry Vincent.[1] His father was one of the deputation which presented the address, and he himself afterwards drew up a letter signed "By authority of the Committee," justifying the action of the deputation. A little later, over the name "Common Sense" he wrote a letter headed

[1] *Autobiography,* i., 250.

"Magisterial Interference," animadverting on the action of the magistrates with reference to a meeting to be held by Mr. Sturge in the Assembly Rooms. There is also in his handwriting copy of a Memorial from the Electors and Non-Electors of Derby, to Edward Strutt, Esq., M.P., and the Hon. J. G. B. Ponsonby, M.P., requesting them "as representatives of the Electors of this Borough in Parliament to survey the condition and prospects of our country with the seriousness befitting men who necessarily contribute by their position to influence its weal or woe." For a time he was secretary of the Derby branch of the Complete Suffrage Union, being also sent as a delegate to the Birmingham Conference of December, 1842. On a Draft Bill, drawn up by the Union, he has written: "I preserve this draft copy partly because of my name written on it. It was written in a state of high excitement, and is, I think, the boldest I ever wrote."[1] Here is the signature.



His mental activity may be gathered from memoranda on education, morals, politics, religion, &c., some of which were probably intended to be expanded into articles or tracts. The formation of a natural alphabet and a duodecimal system of numeration was also thought of.[2] A series of papers on "the machinery outcry"

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 251-2.
[2] *Ibid.*, i., 246, and p. 617, Appendix E.

was projected, a draft of part of the introductory article being extant.

There is perhaps nothing that has been the origin of so many theories and conjectures as the question—What is the cause of our national distress? . . . We are perhaps the more inclined to judge thus leniently [of the many theories] because we too have our particular notions respecting this same national distress, and probably also our favourite crotchet for its removal. We conceive that the great family of ills that have been for so long preying upon the national prosperity, wasting the resources and paralysing the energies of the people, are all the offspring of the one primary and hitherto almost unsuspected evil—over-legislation. . . . We can discover no radical remedy for our social maladies but a stringent regulation which shall confine our governors to the performance of their primitive duty—the protection of person and property. [By way of clearing the ground, he would start] by pointing out what *are not* the causes of distress. And first we propose to combat the popular notion that machinery is the main cause of our national evils.

Early in May, 1843, he entered on what he calls "a campaign in London," resolved to give literature a fair trial, and "not without good hopes of success," as he wrote to his mother soon after arriving in town. "You are probably aware," he writes to Miss ——, "that I have pretty nearly decided to cut engineering, because, as the saying is, it has cut me—that I am directing my attention to another profession, namely, the literary, and am in a fair way of becoming one of that class eloquently termed 'the press gang.'" His first task was the publication as a pamphlet of the letters "On the Proper Sphere of Government." Towards the end of June he

says: "I have been this evening 'traipsing' (as my mother would say) about London, leaving copies at the offices of the weekly Liberal papers. I also called at the publisher's and found that they were going off pretty fairly." What a serious undertaking the publication was, with his slender resources, may be inferred from the fact that the printer's account was finally settled only in April, 1845.

Within a few days of his arrival he had called on Mr. Miall.

To his Father.

14 *May*, 1843.

He entered into my views with a very friendly interest, and expressed himself as desirous of doing all that he could do to forward my wishes. He even went so far as to say that if the *Nonconformist* had had a more extensive circulation he should have been happy to have offered me a share in the editorship. . . . He wrote me a letter of introduction to Dr. Price, the editor of the *Eclectic Review*, telling him my views and proposing me to him as a contributor to his magazine. . . . In answer to Mr. Miall's question what subject I was thinking of taking for my first article, I told him—Education.

2 *June*.—I do not know exactly what to think of it [the Education article] myself. It is, I think, pretty completely original, but whether it will suit the readers of the *Eclectic*, I hardly know.

28 *July*.—I am somewhat disheartened at the aspect which my affairs have at the present time. I see by the advertisement in the papers that my article will not appear in the *Eclectic Review* this month.

30 *October*.—I have never had any decisive answer from Dr. Price, and I must say that he has treated me

rather shabbily; for of two notes I have written to him . . . he has never taken any notice of either. I intend to call in a day or two to request the return of my MS. It may after all be the best as it is, for there are ideas in it which, if I write this essay, will be of great advantage to me, and if they had been previously published it would not have been so well. . . . [A prize had been offered for an essay on Education, the judges being Dr. Venn and several Wesleyan ministers. Of the latter he was doubtful.] If they have the usual character of Wesleyan ministers, I expect that my style of treating the subject would find little favour with them. If they are men of philosophical minds I think I should stand a very fair chance, for I think there are but few that have taken the same broad views of the question, . . . many of which are new even to you.

31 *October*.—I found, much to my chagrin, that I had quite mistaken the character of the work, for instead of its making the question of State education the main object of the essay, it puts it in a comparatively secondary position, and directs the attention chiefly to the investigation of the American and Continental systems and other like matters of detail. I had forgotten this and had imagined that it would afford scope for a philosophical examination of the great principles of education.

His experiences with *Tait's Magazine* were not more encouraging. "I am about to commence my article for *Tait's Magazine*," he told his father (2 June): "The title is to be 'The Free-Trade Movement and what we may learn from it.'" In the course of writing he changed the title into "Honesty is the Best Policy." "The object of the essay is to show that this is equally true of nations as of individuals. There is, I believe,



MRS. ORDISH.

From a sketch made by Herbert Spencer about 1842.

LIBRARY
C. 1
MANCHESTER COLLEGE

a better selection of illustration, figures, and simile in it than in anything I have yet written."[1]

The article was not accepted, but one with the same title appeared in the Birmingham *Pilot,* during his brief sub-editorship of that paper.

His inexperience of the world comes out in a letter to his mother written soon after reaching London. "I can't get on in engineering without *patronage.* In literature *talent* only is required." He was soon to learn that this dictum regarding literature was by no means true.

To his Father.

7 *July,* 1843.

I have had a letter from *Tait,* acknowledging receipt of my paper, but wishing to know *who I am.* I gave him some account of my circumstances and mentioned my relationship to Mr. Spencer of Hinton. I was very near saying amongst other things that I was myself in the habit of judging of things by their intrinsic merit without regarding the name of the party by whom they were written, and that I wished other persons would do the same; but I thought it might unnecessarily offend, and so I refrained.[2]

His letters show that he approached the study of mental functions through the avenue of phrenology, his conclusions being reached, as he more than once is careful to mention, not theoretically only, but by observation. While writing an article for the *Phrenological Journal*

[1] In the *Autobiography* (i., 258) he says the article for *Tait* was afterwards developed into the article on "The Philosophy of Style." Perhaps he wrote a second article for *Tait,* but it is not mentioned in the correspondence.

[2] This reminds one of the "pungent little note" Carlyle thought of writing to Jeffrey on hearing nothing about his first contribution to the *Edinburgh Review.*

on his " New Theory of Benevolence and Imitation " he began " another article in conjunction with it " on " Wonder." The *Phrenological Journal,* like the *Eclectic* and *Tait,* declined his contributions. Probably he was now convinced that talent without patronage was no more powerful in literature than in engineering.

Occasionally he wrote for the *Nonconformist.* The Rebecca riots furnished the text for an article entitled " Effervescence—Rebecca and her Daughters." The incendiaries in the eastern counties suggested one on " Local Inflammations and their Causes." In " The Non-Intrusion Riots " he deals with the disturbances in Scotland, arising from " the determined opposition given by the State party to the erection of edifices for the Free Church." In an article on " Mr. Hume and National Education " he opposed the doctrine " that it is the duty of the State to educate the people."

The pamphlet " On the Proper Sphere of Government " he describes to Mr. Lott as " political pills," or " Spencer's National Specific." " They are very good remedies for Tyranny and Toryism, and when duly digested are calculated to drive away crude notions and brace the system. So at least pretends the inventor." Replying to words of caution from his friend, he writes (14 October) :—

Your remarks in reference to the inexpediency of administering " my specific " to the nation at the present time are derived from a code of moral conduct which I do not recognise. I think you have heard me say that whenever we believe a given line of conduct to be a right one, it is our duty to follow it without confusing our fallible minds respecting the probable result, of which we are rarely capable of judging. The fact that

it is right should be sufficient guarantee that it is expedient; and believing this, I argue that if any proposed course of national conduct is just, it is our duty to adopt it, however imprudent it may appear. No doubt many will consider this a very silly doctrine, and perhaps yourself among the rest. When, however, you consider the changes that must take place before the *general reception* of such principles as those advocated in the "Proper Sphere of Government," and the length of time that must elapse before they can be put into practice, I think you will see that your objection respecting the unfitness of the nation will vanish. Such principles, it must be remembered, are to be carried out by moral agency. . . . Such being the case they can never be acted upon until the majority of the people are convinced of their truth; and when the people are convinced of their truth, then will the nation be fitted for them. . . . It is in this light also that I viewed the question of complete suffrage. I admit that were the people placed by some *external* power in possession of the franchise at the present moment, it would be deleterious. Not that I believe it would be followed by any of the national convulsions that are prophesied by some; but because it would put a stop to that development of the higher sentiments of humanity which are necessary to produce permanent stability in a democratic form of government. I look upon despotisms, aristocracies, priestcrafts, and all the other evils that afflict humanity, as the necessary agents for the training of the human mind, and I believe that every people must pass through the various phases between absolutism and democracy before they are fitted to become *permanently* free, and if a nation liberates itself by physical force, and attains the goal without passing through these *moral ordeals,* I do not think its freedom will be lasting.

Although taking an active part in the Anti-Corn Law, Anti-Slavery, and the Anti-Church and State agitations,

he seldom spoke at meetings. Writing was more in his line.

To his Father.

11 *October*, 1843.

The address which I have written for the Anti-State Church Association is now printing. The reason that it has been so long about is that although asked along with the other members of the committee to write one I could not, although I tried several times, make anything to please myself, so I left it to rest. None of those that were brought forward were liked, however, and the end of the matter was that the committee put them all into my hands, and asked me to make one from them. When I came to set about this I found, however, that this plan would not do, and so I was obliged to write an entirely new one, which was unanimously adopted. I am not by any means satisfied with it myself, however, and in fact I am getting so fastidious in matters of that kind that I hardly ever feel satisfied with what I write.

This address to the Nonconformists of England, dated October, 1843, is signed by the Honorary Secretaries, George Simmons and Charles S. Miall. Spencer's name does not appear; but on a printed copy he has pencilled: "Written by myself during my indignation phase."[1] Regarding facility in composition he tells his father: "If I improve in composition at the rate I have done I shall soon make something out. I have lately got in my head a theory of composition by the aid of which I expect to be able to write more effectually than I could [formerly do.]" This was probably the germ of the essay on "The Philosophy of Style."

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 272.

His hope of succeeding in literature enabled him to bear up for a time against discouragement. At the end of the second month, though he had not made a farthing by his pen, he felt "but little doubt about succeeding in some way or other. At any rate I shall not give it up without a good struggle." Meanwhile, he accepted an engagement with Mr. W. B. Prichard to make drawings of a design for a dock at Southampton. This was finished early in October; and while waiting for the directors to decide about the dock, he worked on a "design for a landing pier at Dover. . . . I had a good share in the design myself, and my arrangements were in every case adopted." The temporary nature of this engagement did not disquiet him. "I have myself no desire for its continuance further than may be necessary to occupy my time until I get launched in the literary world."

He had little time for lighter pursuits or general reading. "Do you get to see *Punch?*" he asks his father. "It is a most capital publication, and I have no doubt is doing a great deal of good, seeing that it disseminates right sentiments amongst those who would never obtain them from any other source. It has lately concluded a series of most excellent articles entitled, 'The Labours of Hercules,' embodying very moral views."[1] Again: "I have been lately reading Pope's *Homer*. . . . To my taste there is but little real poetry in it . . . it is not to be compared to Milton." He himself suffered about this time from a short attack of "the verse-making disorder, which seems to be escaped by but few of those who have any intellectual vivacity." About

[1] *Punch*, May to August, 1843.

fifty lines of a poem on "The Cloud Spirits" are probably among the verses referred to in the *Autobiography* (i., 260).

His circumstances were unfavourable to mechanical inventiveness; but in preparing his pamphlet he "introduced a new plan of stitching." A design for an improved goods wagon was not registered because, he says, "I saw Charles Fox the last time I called, and he told me that my invention was not new." As to the success of his plan of using a steel plate for the soles of boots and shoes he had "very strong hopes."

It is pathetic to trace the disillusioning process which changed the fair picture of literary success into a dull canvas unrelieved by light or colour. A day or two after his arrival in London he wrote: "Altogether I feel very much inclined to be hopeful, and believe there is but little question as to my ultimate success." When he wrote two months later, "I feel well convinced that if I can only stand my ground for a short time I shall do," there was implied a vague consciousness that standing his ground was a longer affair than he had counted upon. By the end of the first week in August his funds were exhausted. "I am afraid I must get you to pay the postage on this, for I am down to my last penny." Two days later, acknowledging the first half of a note his father had sent him, he says: "I am still without a penny in my pocket, and as I shall not get your letter containing the other half of the note until after post time to-morrow. . . . I must send off this letter in the same predicament as its predecessor." The offer of a tutorship had been declined, the temporary engineering engagement being more remunerative and more likely

" to lead to something else, if it should turn out that I am not able to get any literary employment by the time that it has expired. . . . The fact is that I have made up my mind to continue, if possible, my exertions to make my way in the literary world, and it will be nothing but real necessity that will induce me to make another change."

To his Father.

28 *October,* 1843.

I am somewhat in a predicament. At the time that I formed the engagement with Mr. Prichard I was beginning to get rather awkwardly situated with regard to my wardrobe; so much so that my only coat was too shabby to serve decently for Sundays. Under the impression that the employment then commenced would be of some duration I had a new coat made, believing that I should very shortly be able to pay for it. In consequence, however, of the engagement terminating sooner than I had anticipated I was not able to do so, and the little money that I had saved during its continuance is now about exhausted; and just at this juncture I have received the enclosed letter from the tailor's solicitor requesting to know why I do not discharge the bill. [As for re-employment in connexion with the Southampton docks] I find that the matter is likely to be so long delayed that there is no likelihood of my being able to wait for it. I have been waiting too, in the fond hope that I might receive a remittance from *Tait,* but have been disappointed. So that I am rather in a fix. I am even now somewhat put to it in the article of clothes, and have been obliged to remain at home for the last four or five Sundays in consequence of my not having a pair of trousers fit to go out in. I do not see that I can for the present do anything else than return home. It is impossible for me to remain here doing nothing. I do not see any likelihood of my getting any-

thing to do in the literary way immediately, although there might be an opening by and by. I am still as confident as ever that I could make my way as a literary character if I could once get a start, and I think you will agree with me in that belief.

These extracts tell their own tale as to the extreme poverty to which he was reduced. To enable him to reach home his father sent him £5, on receipt of which he writes:—

I am exceedingly sorry that I should put you to any inconvenience in consequence of my want of success. I had quite hoped to have been by this time able to have refunded you what you have already kindly advanced. To be obliged to again draw upon you, and that, too, when you are yourself somewhat short, I feel extremely annoyed. I wish I could have avoided it, and am sure you will give me credit for the will to do so had I had the means. . . . I have never received anything from Mr. Miall for my articles, nor did I ever expect to do so, for I always felt that he had acted kindly towards me, and I was desirous to do what I could to oblige him. . . . The only remuneration I have yet received for my literary endeavours has been the 7s. 6d. that was paid me by Mr. Prichard for correcting his MS. . . . The printer's account must stand over for the present.

Early in November he returned home. He immediately set about the publication of the article on " Imitation and Benevolence " which had been declined by the *Phrenological Journal*. A place was found for it in the *Zoist* of January, 1844. Another on " Amativeness " appeared in July, and a third on " Wonder " in October.[1]

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 261.

An article on "Reciprocal Dependence in the Animal and Vegetable Creations" appeared in the *Philosophical Magazine* for February.[1]

Before he left London he had promised to make his father's *shorthand* ready for publication. For this he was not ill-prepared, having sedulously practised it: only one letter to his father from London having been written in long hand. He drew up an exposition of the system, hoping that the book would be issued in 1844. But his father's lack of decision when a final step had to be taken could not be overcome. Fifty years had to run their course before the booklet appeared.

A periodical to be called *The Philosopher* was projected, January 3, 1844, being fixed for the first issue. What looks like a statement of "Our Objects" runs as follows:—

The signs of the times are indicating the near approach of that era of civilisation when men shall have shaken off the soul-debasing shackles of prejudice. The human race is not for ever to be misruled by the random dictates of unbridled passion. The long acknowledged rationality of man and the obvious corollary that he is to be guided by his reason rather than by his feelings, is at length obtaining a practical recognition. On every hand and from every rank is springing up that healthful spirit of enquiry which brooks not the control of mere antiquated authority, and something more than the absolute dicta of the learned will henceforth be required to satisfy the minds of the people. Respect for precedent is on the wane, and that veneration heretofore bestowed upon unmeaning custom is now being rapidly transferred to objects more worthy its regard—

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 276 and 624, Appendix F.

here manifesting itself in an increased zeal for the discovery of TRUTH, and there in that deep appreciation of PRINCIPLES which characterises the real reformers of the day.

The buoyant hopefulness of these utterances have their pathetic contrast in his description, half a century later, of the moral and intellectual progress achieved, and in his outlook on the social and political horizon at the time when his labours and his life were drawing towards their close.

The idea of starting such a periodical shows how much the young man was influenced by the desire to possess a medium for the dissemination of his ideas. For a living, his hopes were centred on a type-founding invention which was expected to realise a fortune, if only he could find the necessary capital, estimated at from £5,000 to £7,000. On the advice of his uncle Thomas, he wrote to Mr. Lawrence Heyworth "to enquire whether, amongst your mercantile friends, there are any of enterprising characters who are seeking investments for their capital." The correspondence with Mr. Heyworth which ensued led to nothing from a financial point of view. In another respect it led to something he valued more than money—the friendship of Mr. and Mrs. Potter and their children and grandchildren, which brightened the whole of his future life.

Teaching, never lost sight of altogether, was again forcing itself upon his attention. His uncle's suggestion that he should take pupils independently of his father he thought "a very hazardous experiment," and a private tutorship would lead to nothing permanent. His own plan was that his father should continue as at

present, he himself taking pupils who would board with his parents. If this succeeded, his father could, after a time, "relinquish private tuition and devote all his attention to his boarders." A draft prospectus was drawn up and sent to Hinton, where it was objected to as being "too ambitious."

An offer of more congenial employment put a stop to the carrying out of these plans.[1] Through the instrumentality of Mr. Sturge he received the offer of the sub-editorship of a paper it was proposed to start in Birmingham. He joined the *Pilot*, as the new venture was called, early in September, but the first number did not appear till the end of the month, by which date his position seemed so insecure that his father, as well as Mr. Sturge, advised him to accept a tutorship. As was his wont when in the early stages of a new enterprise, he himself was full of confidence. "Wilson and I are at present engaged in coming to a definite arrangement." His uncle Thomas was extremely dissatisfied with the unbusinesslike way in which the duties had been undertaken. "Surely Herbert has managed more wisely than to enter upon a matter first and make his terms afterwards. . . . This I know, that I gave my plain advice to Herbert by letter not to engage in such an offer except with a fixed salary." Mr. Sturge made clear how far he had been a party to the arrangement. "I have no interest in the paper in the common acceptation of the term, and it has no connexion with the Complete Suffrage Union, but I am one of the contributors to a fund for starting it, with the understanding that it advocates certain principles."

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 283-7.

To Edward Lott.

1 *October*, 1844.

You ask how I like Wilson.[1] . . . We agree tolerably —I may say very well in our political principles, and he is more liberal than most on religious questions. I cannot say, however, that there is that thorough cordiality of feeling between us that constitutes the basis of close friendship. We do not *sympathise* with each other. . . . Simple and ordinary matters he manages with great success. He composes rapidly. . . . But where, as in the business of getting out our first number, a matter of considerable magnitude and complication has to be transacted and a great amount of management and direction is required, he appears to become comparatively powerless, paralysed and confused. . . . Having the larger head of the two I seem tacitly to take the lead.

Fortunately for Spencer in his precarious position, an offer of temporary railway work came in his way, and for some weeks he divided his time between that and his sub-editorial duties. The articles he wrote bear evidence that the " indignation phase " had not yet been outlived. Here are a few samples.

Good government can only be secured by basing our political institutions on principle. The party distinctions of Whig and Tory must perish. Radicalism will have done its work when it has uprooted the deadly upas tree, when it has razed to the foundation the great citadel of legislative corruption in which our rulers now dwell; and when a superstructure of truth and righteousness shall have been erected in its stead.

The day is fast coming when mankind shall no longer blunder on in the darkness of expediency—when

[1] Rev. Dr. James Wilson. To be distinguished from Mr. James Wilson, proprietor and editor of the *Economist*. See *Autobiography*, i., 283, 378-80, 383-4.

they shall cease to walk in the ways of their own fallibility, and shall follow those which the Creator says are best; when they shall bow down the stiff neck of their worldly wisdom to the practical embodiment of divine laws; when they shall find that the sense of right which God has implanted in man is meant to be obeyed—that it is the only true guide to general happiness, and that our disobedience to it ever has brought and ever will bring its own punishment.

Englishmen have long ceased to venerate their system of government—it is some time since they left off admiring it—they have now given up respecting it—and it seems that they will by and by despise it. Ere long, then, the existing order of things must pass away.

In these articles unfailing optimism concerning the future goes hand in hand with unqualified denunciation of the past and present. Small wonder is there that Mr. Lott should remonstrate: "Though by your title you ought to be able to steer clear of all rocks and dangers, yet there is one which I will tell you of. . . . Do not use such terms as 'swindling aristocracy.' They do no good, but only serve to enflame the passions of one class of men against the other."

CHAPTER V

ENGINEERING ONCE MORE

(*January*, 1845—*December*, 1848)

Nearly four years had elapsed since he gave up his profession, strong in the hope that by the exercise of his inventive faculties he would realise such a competence as would afford him the leisure and the means of developing and giving to the world the ideas which had been fermenting in his mind. During those years he had courted literature to little or no purpose. And now, at the opening of 1845, a settled career seemed as far off as ever. Had he been able to lift the veil that hid the future and look through the vista extending over four more years of fruitless endeavour—of trial and failure, of hope deferred and anticipations unfulfilled—he might have lost heart and given up the contest. For that indomitable will, which, in after years even unto the end, kept him true to the great aim of his life, had not yet acquired its matured strength. He was now to revert for a time to engineering without getting any nearer success than when he left the profession in 1841. His inventiveness, whatever gratification it might bring as an exercise of power, was not to add much to his material resources. Behind these, in moments when the

Note.—*Autobiography*, i., chaps. xvi., xvii., xviii., xix., xix*a*.

outlook was most obscured, there always loomed teaching, " the ancestral profession."

The survey of the proposed branch line to Wolverhampton, which was expected to take him away from the *Pilot* for about a month, was prolonged to several months, his sub-editorial engagement coming to an end without formal notice. April found him in London, sauntering about the lobbies of the House of Commons and tasting some of the pleasures of London life. The withdrawal of the Bill left him about the middle of May again out of employment. At this juncture Mr. Fox offered him a post. " This work," he tells his father, " will involve an agreeable mixture of in-door and out-of-door work—will give occasion to expeditions into various parts of the kingdom, and will afford plenty of scope for the exercise of my inventive faculty. . . . I am to begin at a salary of £130 per annum, which Mr. Fox says, I may increase to almost any extent if I manage the work well." The engagement lasted only a few weeks, owing to his refusal to perform duties not included in the agreement. One would have thought that repeated failures to find remunerative work would have inclined him to act less upon the strict interpretation of his rights and to follow the rule of give and take. Writing about this in after life he says that the result " was one which naturally grew out of my tendency to rebel against anything like injustice, at whatever risks." Very opportunely Mr. Prichard offered him work on a projected line between Aberystwith and Crewe. Presently he was put in charge of the office " and all the draughtsmen employed in it until the 30th November at the rate of £4 per day." " Here I am in a new

position and have the opportunity of trying my hand at the management of considerable undertakings. So far I have done very well. The office was in a state of utter confusion when I came to it, without the remotest sign of organisation, and I have now put it in order, and made all the necessary arrangements, and all goes on smoothly.'' During 1846 he was taken up with lawsuits arising out of Mr. Prichard's operations—disputes which were continued into the latter half of 1847.

What leisure he had was spent in '' inventing and castle-building.'' He '' devised a pair of skates made wholly of steel and iron in such a manner that there was nothing beyond the depth of the skate blade between the ice and the sole of the boot, the result being to give a greater power over the edge of the skate.'' Another invention was a means of locomotion '' uniting terrestrial traction with aerial suspension,'' which, however, came to nothing. But he continued to be '' very sanguine '' as to his invention in the manufacture of boots and shoes.

To his Father.

Daventry, 16 *September*, 1845.

I expect to make as much money this autumn as will serve to take out a patent, and if I can do this, and if, as I have heard, you can put as many inventions into one patent as you like, I think I am safe to make something out [of them]; for I am pretty certain that *all* my inventions will not fail. By the way, I have made several new inventions since I saw you, two of which (a new kind of division for levelling staves and a new off-set scale apparatus) I have put in practice and they are highly approved of by all who have seen them.

Another is a new hand-printing press, which is both simpler and more powerful than the old kind.

18 *September,* 1846.—I find I am a day after the fair in my invention for raising water. It has just been patented.

23 *October.*—Upon a close search into the late patents I find that there is nothing approaching to my roofing invention, so that in that case I think I am safe in point of priority.

He was more successful with a binding pin,[1] which was in the market in April, 1847, and by May 8 his profits were £45. But about the beginning of the following year the sales fell off, and soon ceased. A more important invention was a machine for planing wood by the substitution " of a circular revolving cutting blade for the straight fixed cutting blade now used in such machines." In this enterprise his friend Jackson joined him. During the whole of 1847 it occupied more of his attention than anything else. The model was tried " and considering everything, the result is very satisfactory." " The only sérious impediment is the formation of circular marks across the wood. In other respects there is no doubt about success." Experiments were carried on in Derby, alterations from time to time being made to meet unexpected difficulties. His partner was beginning to have doubts. " If you do not see any improvement, I would rather wind up the business and pay you my share of expenses and understand the matter settled, than leave it open without any hope." Spencer's remonstrances against this decision were unavail-

[1] *Autobiography,* i., 639.

ing, and soon after, Mr. Jackson went to India. Thus ended the enterprise. Mention is also made of a "type-composing engine, on which I think of trying some experiments when I get to Derby."

From incidental remarks one gains some idea of his miscellaneous reading and literary tastes. Shelley was his favourite poet.

To Edward Lott.

London, 1 *August*, 1845.

They [Shelley's essays and letters] do not give any indication of the genius that shines through his poetry. Of this last I have become a more and more devoted admirer. I cannot but think his "Prometheus Unbound" the finest composition in the language.[1]

30 *October*.—I have just been reading Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, with which I cannot say I am much pleased. It is in some respects natural, and pourtrays with considerable skill the changeable conditions of a mind in process of development, but it is extremely defective in point of plot, and anything but profound in much of its philosophy.

10 *March*, 1846.—[Of Carlyle's *Cromwell* he had a poor opinion.] The "showman," as you call him, I think somewhat impertinent upon occasion. The editorial remarks and exclamations with which he interpolates the letters are not at all in good taste, and *I* think anything but respectful to his hero.

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 299, 339. His youthful enthusiasm for Shelley must have been brought back to him in 1888 on receipt of a copy of Mr. Kineton Parkes' *Shelley's Revolt of Islam and Mr. Herbert Spencer's Ecclesiastical Institutions*. In this paper it is contended that the "Revolt of Islam" is a vehement protest, "Ecclesiastical Institutions" a calm, logical statement. Though differing in form, the fundamental idea is the same.

EDWARD LOTT.

From a sketch made by Herbert Spencer about 1842.

The dying moments of 1846.—Have you seen Dickens's Christmas tale yet? . . . It is a poor affair, and the moral is so extra-philanthropic as to be absurd. It goes to the extent of not only loving your neighbour as yourself—but even loving him better than yourself.

In a letter to his father in March, 1845, the *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* is mentioned as a book just out, but not yet read. In January of the following year he is about to read Humboldt's *Kosmos*.

The want of society was frequently deplored. But in 1846 or 1847 he became acquainted with Mr. Chapman, the publisher, and through him with others of note. About this he says:—

A generation ago the only liberal publisher in London was Green, the unitarian publisher who had a shop in Newgate Street. My uncle published sundry of his pamphlets with Green. I fancy it was to fulfil some commission from him concerning them that about 1846 I called at the shop, and instead of finding the name Green, found it changed to Chapman. Green had retired, and Chapman had bought his business. . . . I continued still in those days to have no circle of London friends, and hence remember the more vividly any exception to my usual solitary life. Such an exception resulted from this interview. Chapman lived out at Clapton, and in 1846, or possibly it may have been 1847, I went out to an evening party there. I am led to recall the fact because among other guests there was Miss Eliza Lynn, who afterwards became well known as Mrs. Lynn Linton, the novelist. . . . Another of those present was Miss Sara Hennel. . . . William and Mary Howitt, too, whose names were at that day familiar to the reading public, were among the guests either then or on a subsequent occasion.

Only occasionally do we meet with indications of an interest in current politics. Measures, not parties, were what he cared for. To forward Mr. Heyworth's candidature for the representation of Derby in Parliament he wrote a skit headed—"Why you should vote for Freshfield and Lord ——," in which he ironically advises the electors to vote for lawyers. Passive resisters may quote him as on their side. He would like to see "some vigorous resistance to the proposed Militia. . . . I for one have made up my mind neither to serve nor to find a substitute."

To his Father.

3 *September*, 1846.

I have no objection to a whole host of Churchmen and Protectionists getting into the next Parliament—in fact, I rather wish they may. The great thing to be wished is the crippling of Lord John Russell to disable him from carrying his educational and endowment measures. . . . It will do him and the Whigs generally good to be made to feel the determination of the Nonconformists."

In the many arguments he had on religious questions he usually stood alone, his heterodoxy being so pronounced. He has told us in the *Autobiography* (i., 316) how this cost him the loss of one friendship. But with most of his friends it led to no estrangement, nor to any weakening of sympathy with him in his intellectual and social aims. The unpalatableness of many of his opinions was counter-balanced by the attractiveness of his character, in which absolute straightforwardness shone conspicuously. To "the open sincerity that is to

me the best part of you," Mr. Lott traced the liking women had for him.

Beyond an article for the *Nonconformist* in December, 1846, on "Justice before Generosity," he does not appear to have published anything. During this year he entered upon a course of reading in preparation for the book he had long wished to write, and by April he had collected "a large mass of matter." He had for some time been dissatisfied with the want of depth and precision in the general argument of the letters "On the Proper Sphere of Government." Hence his desire to write a book in which the views set forth in the pamphlet should be affiliated to general moral principles. Here is a letter which throws unexpected light upon the method by which he sought to form his style.

To his Father.

16 *June*, 1847.

I am prosecuting my studies on style (which I am doing with the intention of shortly commencing my "Moral Philosophy"), and am adopting the plan of copying out specimen sentences. Whenever I meet with any that are peculiar either by their clearness, harmony, force, brevity, novelty, or distinguished by any peculiarity, I copy it out. I wish to collect samples of all possible arrangements and effects that have anything good in them.

If you meet with any particularly worthy of note, perhaps you will be good enough to copy them out for me.

30 *September*.—For the purpose of getting information requisite for my book, I have obtained access to the library of the British Museum. I did this by writing to Mr. Bright, M.P., for a recommendation.

The writing of a book went, however, but a little way towards answering the persistent question about a livelihood, which seemed no nearer solution in 1848 than it was in 1841. Migration to New Zealand was thought of, and teaching came up once more, and, as it proved, for the last time, as a possible way of meeting sordid cares.

To his Uncle Thomas.

Derby, 10 *April*, 1848.

Were there any likelihood of its answering I should be inclined to join my father in his teaching, but as he has not a sufficiency of engagements to occupy his own time, there is no inducement to take such a step. Do you think there is room for a mathematical teacher in Bath? and would there be anything objectionable in my taking such a position? Perhaps by giving lessons in Perspective, Mechanical Drawing, and Natural Philosophy, in addition to Mathematics, I might be able to make it answer, . . . and with a fair start I do not much doubt my ultimate success.

A few weeks at Bath, whither he went to consult with his uncle and spy out the land, convinced him that nothing was to be found in that direction.

To his Father.

London, 22 *May*, 1848.

Perhaps you have before this heard from Bath that I had left them for London to take another look round and see whether anything was to be done. . . . I have good hope of getting something to do here in the literary way.

10 *June*.—I am likely to make an engagement to write leading articles for this new paper, *The Standard of*

Freedom, and if the negociation ends as it appears likely to do I am to furnish an article weekly at a guinea each.[1]

Engagements merely pending could not support him in London, so he returned home, though not without hope, arising from a conversation with Mr. Wilson of the *Economist.* It was not till November, however, that he received the offer of the post of sub-editor of the *Economist.* " Thus an end was at last put to the seemingly futile part " of his life, which had lasted for over seven and a half years.

[1] *Autobiography,* i., 380, 383.

CHAPTER VI

HIS FIRST BOOK

(*December,* 1848, *to July,* 1853)

Soon after taking up his sub-editorial duties in the Strand he tells his mother: "I manage my work very well so far, and have given satisfaction to Mr. Wilson—indeed, I have been complimented by him upon the improvement the paper has undergone, more particularly in the news department, under my administration." The situation left him with considerable leisure to get on with the book which was to embody the leading ideas that had been taking shape since the time he lived at Powick. But he complained of making slow progress. "Moreover, what I have written I have not written to my satisfaction, at which I am even more annoyed than at having made but little progress."

To his Father.

1 *April,* 1849.

I have now entered upon . . . the political part of the work and am executing it to my satisfaction so far. The chapter that has least pleased me is the one I have lately finished on the Rights of Children. It is mannered in style. I shall have to remodel it when I make my final revision. . . . I do not think there will be any need to fear taking upon myself the responsibility of publication, seeing that the work is so popular in its

Note.—*Autobiography,* i., chaps. xx., xxi., xxii., xxiii., xxiv.

aspirations, so well fitted to the time, and written in a style that is likely to commend it to the general reader.

24 *August.*—I am still not satisfied with the style, though I am with the matter.

With a view to suggestions, the manuscript was being sent to his father, who wrote: "The chapter on National Education pleased me the most, and that on Sanitary Regulation the next. There are some points in the chapter on established religions that I don't think you have proved, but assumed. . . . Then there appears in other places an unnecessary amount of bitterness." Again: "Your mother says she fears you make by your style unnecessary enemies. That you should not have introduced the name of Voltaire into your work at all." On this he remarks: "I had suppressed Voltaire's name on a previous occasion, and I will do it on this."

The question of a title, which had been held in abeyance till the spring of 1850, could no longer be put off. For some six months the point was discussed with relatives and literary friends, first one and then another title being suggested before he finally made up his mind to adopt "Social Statics," notwithstanding the objection raised by his uncle Thomas and Mr. Chapman to the word "Statics."[1]

When he wrote chapter xxv. of the *Autobiography* he could not recall the feelings with which he looked for reviews of the book, nor could he remember whether he was disappointed with their superficial character when they did appear. The correspondence helps to make up for the failure of memory. One of the earliest notices

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 413.

was in his own paper (8 February, 1851). "I am quite satisfied with it; for though the high praise is qualified with some blame, there is not more of this than is needful to prevent the suspicion that I had written the review myself." Several of the notices elicit the remark that "the reviewer has not read the book." The review in the *Nonconformist* (March 12) "was not so well written as it might have been. The reviewer apologised on the score of having a bad headache; so Charles Miall told me." The *Leader,* from which he had expected "flaming reviews," devoted three articles to it.[1] The title, it was remarked, had "led some persons to suppose it to be a work on Socialism"; but as regards property, the author "separates himself from Proudhon and the Communists whom he seemed to be upholding." The chapter on the "Right Use of the Earth" is described as a "terrible chapter," which "places landlords in an unhappy predicament." He was prepared for adverse criticism. "I am rather surprised that I do not get some virulent attacks from the expediency school. Perhaps I may get them in the *Spectator* or *Examiner.* I have written to remind them that the book has been sent; and if they do not now review it I shall assume that not liking it, and yet not knowing how to pull it to pieces, they think best to let it alone." Of articles in the *North British* and the *British Quarterly* he says: "On the whole, I am as well treated in these two Reviews as I could expect, considering the official character of them—indeed, I may say better than I could expect. For, though both criticise unfairly and distort my views, they do not do this so

[1] *Leader,* 15 and 22 March, and 12 April, 1851.

much as party bias frequently leads men to do." In December Mr. Richard Hutton intimated that he was preparing an article on *Social Statics*. "I shall do my best to demolish what I think, in hands so able as yours, may prove to be very misleading errors, but I fear, with far less success in exposition of my own views than you have shown." This article (*Prospective Review* for January, 1852), under the title "Ethics of the Voluntary System," embodied a criticism which Spencer had again and again to rebut in later years. "If a consequence of his theory is absurd, impracticable, unsupported by a shadow of argument, moral or otherwise, he has a theory ready to account for the failure of his theory," namely, "that it only states the rights and duties of perfect man." Of the article generally Spencer says: "There is only one fair criticism in it. All the rest is merely misunderstanding or misrepresentation. I do not like being identified with the 'Ethics of the Voluntary System' either."

Mr. Hutton was not the only one who thought him too ready to take shelter behind the rampart of absolute morality. Mr. Lott urged the same objections, which Spencer tried to meet.

You compare me to a physician "who was perpetually announcing that he only prescribed for man in a normal state of constitution," and say that I "dwell too constantly in the normal state and consequently am disgusted and impatient with the abnormal one." Either you have not read *Social Statics,* or have forgotten a good part of it. So repeatedly have I there insisted that it is impossible to act out the abstract law and impossible to reach a normal state save by the slow process of growth, that I am charged with teaching that we ought

to sit still and do nothing. You will find that I constantly recognise the necessity of existing institutions, and that all social forms have their uses.

In justification of the use of the ordinary language of theology, which, knowing his religious opinions, his father could not understand, he wrote: "I have always felt some difficulty, but have concluded that the usual expressions were as good as any others. Some words to signify the ultimate essence, or principle or cause of things, I was obliged to use, and thinking the current ones as good as any others, I thought best to use them rather than cause needless opposition."

The chapter on "National Education" was a theme of controversy from the beginning. He was invited to lecture on it, but declined. "I should damage my influence by lecturing. Very few men fulfil personally the promise of their books." He mentions to his father that "the National Public School Association are falling foul of me." On the other hand, the Congregational Board of Education reprinted the chapter at Mr. Samuel Morley's expense, under the title "State Education Self-defeating." A second edition being called for, a postscript of six pages was added.

Among those to whom the pamphlet was sent was Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, who wrote about its contents that "he had been much struck with their boldness, originality and absence of all false thinking and rhetorical varnish." Still, he could not arrive at the same conclusion as Spencer with regard to absolute non-interference with education, which he thought was a "somewhat chilling result." "Perhaps there is a difference be-

tween them at starting. Mr. Spencer seems to dislike forming and fitting the mind into national idiosyncrasies. Sir Edward, on the contrary, holds such formation to be essential to the vitality and permanence of States."

As an indication of growing appreciation he mentions, with evident satisfaction, that his name was being coupled with that of Mr. J. S. Mill. "I have had a third application for my autograph," is the first intimation of a familiar experience of later years. The frequent mention of *Social Statics* leads him to say, with an optimism not yet chastened by experience: "If the book is so interesting as this there can be no doubt about its paying."

To his Father.

25 *March*, 1852.

Mrs. Chapman told me . . . they had recently had a letter from a working stonemason, stating that their family monument was much out of repair, and offering to put it in good condition if they would let him have a copy of a work called *Social Statics*. . . . I called the other day on Charles Knight, the publisher, in company with Chapman, when he took the opportunity of thanking me for the great amount of information he had gained from my book. This giving me personal thanks has been quite frequent of late.

All this raised his hopes that a new edition would soon be called for. As early as March, 1851, he had begun to revise it, paying much attention to style. "I am surprised to find so many defects." "I have been subjecting Macaulay's style to the same minute criticism that I am now giving my own, and I find that it will not stand it at all."

When he joined the *Economist* there was little of the

cheery optimism that was so marked on his going to London in 1843. His uncertainty as to the future may be gathered from the fact that emigration to New Zealand was again being discussed. "What should you say to our all going out together?" he asks his mother. The risks to his parents of such a long voyage and his reluctance to leave them behind, led to the idea being given up. Emigration was, moreover, gradually losing its attractiveness as interest in his book became more engrossing and the prospects of a literary career improved.

About his general reading during these years little is known. He had decided views as to what was worth reading. Carpenter's *Principles of Physiology* was deemed "considerably more useful and vastly more entertaining" than books about "fights and despatches and protocols." He did not think that gossip about current events "would at all help me in learning how to live healthily and happily, or that it would give me any further insight into the nature of things." Nor did he care for what is called history.

To Edward Lott.

23 *April*, 1852.

My position, stated briefly, is that until you have got a true theory of humanity, you cannot interpret history; and when you have got a true theory of humanity *you do not want history*. You can draw no inference from the facts and alleged facts of history without your conceptions of human nature entering into that inference: and unless your conceptions of human nature are true your inference will be vicious. But if your conceptions of human nature be true you need none of the inferences drawn from history for your guidance. If you ask how

is one to get a true theory of humanity, I reply—study it in the facts you see around you and in the general laws of life. For myself, looking as I do at humanity as the highest result yet of the evolution of life on the earth, I prefer to take in the whole series of phenomena from the beginning as far as they are ascertainable. I, too, am a lover of history; but it is the history of the Cosmos as a whole. I believe that you might as reasonably expect to understand the nature of an adult man by watching him for an hour (being in ignorance of all his antecedents), as to suppose that you can fathom humanity by studying the last few thousand years of its evolution.

In the spring of 1850 he had ceased to live at the office of the *Economist,* and took lodgings in Paddington along with Mr. Jackson, whom he had joined in trying vegetarianism. Of this experiment he tells his mother (whom, by the way, he reproves for her "dietetic habits," and "constitutional Toryism"): "I am getting quite learned in cooking and am daily scheming new combinations, some of which have been very successful. I will by and by send you our diet table, which, I doubt not, will in time be sufficiently varied and palatable, as well as nutritious." Vegetarianism, not coming up to expectations, was given up before the end of the second month.

The year 1851 witnessed the inevitable reaction after the strenuous efforts of the two previous years. As regards visible results it may deserve the title "An Idle Year," given it in the *Autobiography,* but in reality the ground was being prepared for the fertile productiveness that was to follow. It was the year of the Great Exhibition, which "passes all expectation." He was partic-

ularly anxious that his mother, "with her passion for sight-seeing," should not miss coming up, and advised his father and uncle William to come up separately, as he could give them more help and attention than if they came together. That his former professional interests had not given place entirely to his newer literary interests was shown by an article on "A Solution of the Water Question" (*Economist,* 20 December), in which he made suggestions for the supply of pure water to London and the improvement of the Thames. A scheme similar to one of the suggestions has been recently before the public, Gravesend taking the place of Greenwich as the site of the proposed dam.

"The early years of the fifties were fertile in friendships commenced." *Social Statics* was instrumental in bringing about an introduction to Mr. Octavius Smith. Acquaintance speedily ripened into intimate friendship, which in due course brought him, in manifold ways, some of the greatest pleasures of his life. The weekly evenings at Mr. Chapman's brought him other friends, one of the earliest being Mr. G. H. Lewes, whom he got to know in the spring of 1850; but with whom there was little intimacy till the following year.

To his Father.

22 *September,* 1851.

I had a very pleasant walking excursion with Lewes on Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday last, up the valley of the Thames. We began about Slough, and got as far as Abingdon. It did us much good, and we enjoyed it immensely. I mentioned to Lewes my notion about the law of vegetable development, and the carrying out the idea in the examination of various plants added

much to the interest of the walk. He was greatly delighted with the doctrine.

3 *October.*—Lewes is about 34 or 35, of middle height, with light brown long hair, deeply marked with smallpox, and rather worn-looking. He is very versatile. He is a successful novelist and dramatist, writes poems occasionally, is an actor, a good linguist, writes for the reviews, translates for the stage, is a musical critic, and is, as you may suppose, deeply read in philosophy. He is a very pleasant companion. He is married and has three children.

About the middle of 1851, Spencer first met Miss Marian Evans, who was on a visit to the Chapmans'. Later in the same year he took Mr. Lewes to call on her. In 1852 he made the acquaintance of Mr. David Masson and Mr. T. H. Huxley. To the latter he introduced himself when seeking information bearing on a theory of population he had entertained as far back as 1847. Regarding this he told his father in September, 1851: "I have commenced drawing out a skeleton plan of my book on population and shall send it to you by and by. I think it will be beautifully complete and perfectly conclusive." Intending it to form a book of some twenty odd chapters, he at first declined Mr. Chapman's request that he should make it the subject of an article. Eventually he agreed to give an outline of it in the *Westminster Review,* and on his return from a Christmas visit to Mr. and Mrs. Potter he set to work on it.

To his Father.

April, 1852.

You have not given me any opinion of the Population article yet. . . . I met Robert Chambers the other night

and he complimented me highly upon it. Mr. Greg disapproves and has narrated to Chapman various objections, but they are easily answerable.

May.—You will be pleased to hear that Professor Owen has nothing to say against the Theory of Population. Chapman asked his opinion of it. He said it was a very good article. Chapman then pressed him to say what he thought of the theory. This he declined to do, stating that he had read it rapidly and was not prepared to give a decisive opinion. His known caution as to new views is sufficient to account for this; and the fact that he raises no objection may be taken as satisfactory. Professor Forbes, an authority who, on such a point, stands perhaps next to Owen, says he "thinks there is some grounds for the theory." He is a cautious Scotchman, and hence probably thinks more than he says.

28 *May.*—I met Professor Forbes on Sunday. He told me that he had read the population article twice and was about to read it a third time. He said he should like to have some talk with me about it.

A notice of the population article in the *Leader* gave rise to a misunderstanding between Mr. Lewes and Spencer. The chief biographical interest of the lengthy correspondence that ensued lies in the fact that it is the first of many instances exemplifying Spencer's extreme sensitiveness about his rights as an original thinker. Mr. Lewes had used expressions which, in Spencer's opinion, "will lead all who read them to suppose that your ideas on the subject were not derived from me, and that the formula just quoted is one originating with yourself." While pained to think that he should be supposed to have denied Spencer's priority, Mr. Lewes maintained that he had arrived at his conclusions by an independent

path, though acknowledging that it was Spencer that had put him on the track in the course of their country rambles. The misunderstanding was cleared up to Spencer's satisfaction, and led to no diminution in their friendship. The article out of which the difference had arisen was, as already stated, the means of initiating a new friendship, the first step towards which was a note dated 25 September, 1852—" the politest note you ever sent me " was Professor Huxley's description of it more than forty years after. " Mr. Herbert Spencer presents his compliments to Mr. Huxley, and would be obliged if Mr. Huxley would inform him *when* and *where* his paper on the Ascidians, just read before the British Association, is likely to be published in full. The contents of the enclosed pamphlet will sufficiently explain Mr. Spencer's reason for asking this information." The friendship thus initiated paved the way to another. In the following year, in the rooms of the Royal Society, Somerset House, Mr. Huxley introduced him to Mr. Tyndall, describing him by a line from Faust as " Ein Kerl der speculirt."

A series of papers in the *Leader* under the head " Travel and Talk " was projected, in which expression was to be given to " the overwhelming accumulation of thoughts " that bothered him. " The Haythorne Papers "—the title finally adopted (*Autobiography,* i. 447)—were to be unsigned, because he " did not wish to be publicly identified with the *Leader's* Socialism." The first, " Use and Beauty," appeared on 3rd January, 1852. The second, " The Development Hypothesis," on 20th March. This was the outcome of several years of thought.

To his Father.

25 *March,* 1852.

The Haythorne Paper, No. II., has created a sensation. I have had many people complimenting me about it. Copies of the paper containing it have been sent to Owen, Lyell, Sedgwick, and others. My consent has been asked to reprint it in the *Reasoner;* and Robert Chambers, after expressing to Lewes his admiration of it, said that he meant to write to Lyell about it.

If things go on in this way my contributions will be getting in demand.

He exerted himself to meet the anticipated demand. Other papers of the series published during the year were "A Theory of Tears and Laughter," "The Sources of Architectural Types," "Gracefulness," and in the middle of the following year "The Valuation of Evidence."

The importance of a clear and forcible style had been impressed on him in season and out of season by his father, and memoranda on the subject had been accumulating for years. In the *Autobiography* he mentions a paper on "Force of Expression" (written for *Tait's Magazine* some nine years before, but declined), as forming the basis of an article now to be written for the *Westminster Review.* In August, 1852, he set to work on it.

To his Father.

1 *October,* 1852.

The article is entitled "The Philosophy of Style." It is good, but a little too scientific. You will find it a great improvement upon the original essay, if you have any recollection of that.

20 *October.*—The article is a good deal praised, both in the press and in private. . . . I shall probably expand it a good deal eventually when I come to republish it along with other "Essays and Critiques." All the articles I write I mean to be of that solid kind that will be worthy of republication; and when my name has risen to the position that it will by and by do, such a republication will pay.

Among the private commendations was one from Alexander Smith, of Edinburgh, who was flattered by the recognition given him in the article, the author of which he was ignorant of until Spencer wrote to him.

To Edward Lott

10 *September,* 1852.

Did I mention to you when in Derby last the new poet Alexander Smith? I consider him unquestionably *the* poet of the age. Though a Scotchman (and I have no partiality for the race) I am strongly inclined to rank him as the greatest poet since Shakespeare. I know no poetry that I read over and over again with such delight.

In a letter to his father of 3rd September, 1851, a hint had been given of a new departure. "I have been much absorbed of late in metaphysics, and believe I have made a great discovery." The following up of the "great discovery" was probably hindered by the writing of the earlier of the Haythorne Papers and the article on "Population"; but in a letter of 12th March, 1852, he says of it: "I mean to produce a sensation." To get time for this he had begun to think of resigning his post on the *Economist,* making up for the loss of salary by writing for the Quarterlies. His mother urged caution.

To his Mother.

27 *October,* 1852.

Do not fear that I shall take the step that alarms you unless I see it safe to do so. . . .

Your objection to the risk is an objection that would apply to every change. . . . But be assured I shall not change until I have well tested the propriety of the step.

The bookselling agitation, initiated by Chapman's article on the "Commerce of Literature" in the *Westminster Review* for April, 1852, at once claimed his active interest. In a letter signed, "An Author," in the *Times* of April 5, he related his experience in connexion with *Social Statics.* A deputation of persons connected with the bookselling trade waited upon Lord Campbell, Dean Milman and Mr. Grote, who had been chosen as arbitrators. The Booksellers' Association failed to establish its case, the result being a decision against it.[1] In 1853 he joined the society formed for promoting the repeal of the taxes on knowledge.

The amount of work he accomplished during 1852 and the first half of 1853 is surprising when one considers the claims upon him arising out of the ill-health of his father and the illness and death of his uncle Thomas. Both father and uncle were proof against warnings. Here is a sample of his letters to his father, giving advice which in after years he might well have followed himself. "I was sorry to find that your nervousness made you, as usual, expect the worst result conceivable. It is a pity, when inclined to take such gloomy views, you cannot call to mind how many times you have prophesied dreadful results and have been mistaken.

[1] *Times,* 15 and 16 April, 1852.

But I suppose some mental idiosyncrasy prevents this." Again and again did he remonstrate with his uncle. Early in 1852 he wrote a paper on the "Value of Physiology," intended for the *National Temperance Chronicle,* edited by his uncle, who, however, "did not publish it when it was written, being offended by an apparent (but unintended) allusion to himself." The illness of his uncle required his frequent attendance at Notting Hill, his aunt being "quite touched by his affectionate interest": she "never saw anything more heartfelt than his grief."

Under the terms of the Will of his uncle, who died in January, 1853, his aunt and he were left executors. This work, which fell mainly on his shoulders, was transacted in what his aunt describes as "a prompt, business-like, satisfactory manner." Legacies were left to his father, his uncle William, and himself. Through all the negotiations he showed an entire absence of a desire to force his views upon his co-executor or co-legatees. Only one matter gave rise to friction. At a meeting held four days after the funeral, "it was agreed that several persons should give a small sketch of Thomas," for consideration at a subsequent meeting, with a view to its publication in the *Temperance Chronicle.*

To his Uncle William.

21 *February,* 1853.

What I had written was received somewhat coolly, not being uniformly eulogistic. It was not, however, objected to at the time. But next day my aunt came to me at the Strand (after Newcombe had gone off with the MS. to Leicester), wishing modification of it, and expressing her dissatisfaction with its tone. Our conversation

ended in my offering to withdraw it, which was agreed to, and a letter was written to that effect at once. It is in type, however, and I have asked Newcombe to have some proofs struck off for me so that you will see what I wrote.

To his Father.

2 *March,* 1853.

I was very much vexed to see yesterday . . . that the sub-secretary, Newcombe, had embodied extracts from it. He was not authorised to do it, and has just defeated me. I wished to say *all* I thought or *none.* I dislike insincere, one-sided statements, and am provoked that what I wrote should have been turned into one.

7 *March.*—I am glad you like the sketch of my uncle Thomas. I almost began afterwards to doubt, when I saw the dissatisfaction it gave, whether I had done him justice. But the fact is, people cannot bear the truth in these matters.

In preparation for the time when he would be thrown entirely upon the proceeds of his pen, he completed his article on "The Universal Postulate," and sketched one on "Over-Legislation."

To his Father.

28 *April,* 1853.

I am busy with the article on "Over-Legislation," which is two-thirds done. I am about to get a letter of introduction for the *North British Review,* so that I may have an article in hand for them by the time I leave the *Economist.*

17 *May.*—I am extremely busy writing. . . . This arises from the fact that both the article on "Over-Legislation" and the one on the "Universal Postulate"

are to be published in the *Westminster*. The first is already done and going to the printer. It is much approved. The other is working out to my full satisfaction.

24 *May*.—I do not think you need feel any nervousness as to my change of position. With the two articles in the next *Westminster*, in addition to all I have written, I do not fear having quite enough demand. I have already taken steps for contributing to the *North British*, as you will see by the enclosed note from Masson, who is one of the chief writers for it. . . . I shall obtain an introduction to Cornewall Lewis, the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, as soon as the next *Westminster* is published.

7 *June*.—I have just been writing to the editor of the *North British*, and have named five articles for him to choose from. I have two-thirds done the "Universal Postulate," which works out quite to my satisfaction.

15 *June*.—The paper on the "Universal Postulate" will not after all go into the next *Westminster*. Editorial exigencies have necessitated its postponement till the succeeding number. However, Chapman proposes to put it into type at once, so that I may send proof sheets to each of the leading thinkers forthwith.

The article on "Over-Legislation" appeared in the *Westminster* for July. The same month he severed his connexion with the *Economist*.

CHAPTER VII

A NEW PSYCHOLOGY

(*July*, 1853—*December*, 1857)

Before settling down to those literary enterprises, that, with the youthful optimism which in those days seldom failed him, were expected to compensate for the loss of a sub-editor's salary, Spencer had resolved to take a holiday in Switzerland along with Mr. Lewes and Mr. Lott, the legacy of £500 from his uncle putting him at ease with respect to finances. From Standish, where he was paying the first of many visits to Mr. and Mrs. Potter, he wrote to his mother with a view to set her anxious mind at rest: "I daresay before I leave this I shall be quite right again, and that my Swiss journey will make me stronger than I have been for years. . . . Do not fear that I shall run into danger in Switzerland, or that I shall over-exert myself. I am too cautious for that."

A list of projected articles had been sent, along with a copy of "The Universal Postulate," to the editor of the *North British Review*.

To A. Campbell Fraser.

London, 29 *July*, 1853.

The article on "Method in Education" which, I infer from your expressions, is the one most likely to suit

Note.—*Autobiography*, i., chaps. xxv., xxvi., xxvii., xxviii., xxix.

your present purposes, is also the one which (of the three you mention) I am best prepared to write. . . . I propose therefore to get the article ready in time for your February number.

30 *July*.—Your note of the 25th requested me to mention any other subject I had in contemplation. Though I had one which I felt would be suitable to you I did not make any rejoinder in my note of yesterday, from the belief that in proposing it I should probably clash with my friend Masson, which I am anxious to avoid doing. I have since seen him, however, and find that he has no intentions in the direction I supposed.

The topic to which I refer is the "Positive Philosophy." Miss Martineau's translation of Comte will be out probably by Christmas; and having much to say on his system—mainly in antagonism to it—I am desirous of reviewing this forthcoming English edition of his works.

On the same day he tells his father that he had agreed to write an article on "Manners and Fashion" for the *Westminster*. "Moreover, I have been *twice pressed* within these few days by the proprietor of the *Leader* to write him a number of Haythorne papers. . . . So you see I shall have as much to do as I want; and all of it on topics of my own choosing. No fear of becoming a hack."

Owing to Mr. Lewes being unable to join and Mr. Lott having to delay starting for some days, he set out alone on the 1st August to begin his acquaintance with foreign countries.

To his Father.

Zurich, 12 *August*, 1853.

I had a few hours to spend at Antwerp which I devoted to seeing the churches. . . . The outside [of the

Cologne Cathedral] I admire extremely, and when finished . . . there will be no such sample of Gothic in the world. The inside, however, I do not admire, save in the grandeur arising from its great size. The architecture is by no means equal to that of the outside, and it is quite spoilt by the chromatic decorations. There is a strange mixture in it of magnificence, tawdriness, and meanness. . . . [Frankfort] is much to be admired. The houses are fine, the streets clean and well paved, and everything looks likely and attractive. On the whole, these continental towns make one feel quite ashamed of ours. . . . Certainly in respect of many things I felt inclined to question our boasted superiority.

In the matter of colouring he thought Switzerland inferior to Scotland. Of this he wrote to Mr. Potter: "I remember being astonished when ascending Loch Lomond at the splendid assemblage of bright purples, reds and blues of various intensities, which the mountains towards the head of the lake presented. I saw nothing to compare with this in Switzerland. Mainly in consequence of this superiority of colouring, I think the view from Ben Nevis quite equal to the view from the Righi."

He had set out with great hopes of benefit to health and with excellent resolutions not to over-exert himself. On his return he wrote: "Although I did not gain as much benefit whilst there as I hoped—though to my surprise I experienced no exhilaration from the mountain air—yet I think the change in constitutional condition is pretty sure to be advantageous." In this he was grievously mistaken. He began to be troubled by his heart. His opinion that this was due to over-exertion will not appear improbable to one who knows what hill-climbing, such as he and his friend accomplished, means

to a person not in training. In reply to enquiries Mr. Frank E. Lott writes:

I never remember my father referring to that holiday or warning me against over-walking, though I believe that he did so on one or two occasions without quoting his own case. My aunt [Mrs. Glover] remembers his return from the 1853 Swiss holiday, and he looked as if he had overdone it, and told them that such was the case. To such an extent had they *both* overstrained themselves that the noise of the river Aar in the valley beside which they were walking on one occasion became unbearable; so that the nervous systems were decidedly strained, and my father was far from naturally a nervous subject.

For many years before his death my father's heart was far from normal, and the more I think the matter over the more I agree with Mr. Spencer that the overstraining of the constitution in 1853 seriously affected both of them.[1]

Before going away he had distributed copies of "The Universal Postulate," one being sent to Sir William Hamilton.

From Sir William Hamilton.

Largo, Fifeshire, 12 *September,* 1853.

But though I admired the talent with which the paper is written, you will excuse me, I am assured, when I say that I by no means coincide with your views upon the points in question. But to enter upon these in detail would engage me in a discussion which, I am afraid, would not be agreeable to you, and for which, in fact, I feel myself at present unable.

Those familiar with the great Scotch philosopher's controversial style will appreciate the force of the re-

[1] *Autobiography,* i., 500-2.

mark that his criticisms would not have been agreeable to the youthful essayist.

"I am making further important discoveries in psychology," he tells his father in October, "and accumulating memoranda. I am getting anxious to begin the book." But before he could take up the projected work on Psychology he had to fulfil the engagements entered into. At home, in November, he worked hard at the article on "Education." On returning to town he set about getting "Manners and Fashions" ready. In March he mentions a Haythorne Paper which had "been standing in type these two months." One on "The Use of Anthropomorphism" had appeared in the *Leader* of November 5. The paper now referred to must be that on "Personal Beauty," the first part of which appeared on April 15, and the second on May 13. There were still two articles to write before he could turn to the *Psychology,* which was "growing into yet grander form in my mind." One was the paper on Comte. In fulfilment of a promise made to Professor Fraser before going to Switzerland, he now offered to send a sketch of the article, being "aware that the topic is one requiring some editorial caution."

To A. Campbell Fraser.

26 *January,* 1854.

The article on Comte would not at all touch on the theological aspect of his doctrine, but would be purely scientific. I propose to call it "The Genesis of Science." It would treat first of the relationships of science to common knowledge, including an important definition which M. Comte has overlooked; next of the incongruities in M. Comte's arrangement, showing that a theory

of the very reverse nature might be founded on his own facts; next of the radical vice of all attempts at a *serial* classification of the sciences—such classification being altogether impossible, and finally of a sketch, partly psychological, partly historical, of what I believe to be the true process of evolution. I will forthwith write out my memoranda under these heads.

I fear that what I should write on the Sanitary Question would be inadmissible in the *North British.* It would be in the same sense as my article on "Over-Legislation" in the *Westminster* for July last. I should endeavour to show that the evidence on which sanitary agitators are demanding more law is grossly garbled and one-sided; that the inferences drawn from local statistics of mortality are in many cases absurdly fallacious; that many of the evils about which the greatest outcry is raised have been themselves *produced* by previous sanitary regulations, and that current legislation will inevitably produce similar ones; further, that the agencies that have brought the drainage, &c., of our towns to its present state would effect all that is needed were *legislation obstructions* removed; with sundry other positions akin to these.

28 *January.*—Herewith I enclose the sketch of the first part, or *de*structive part, of the article on Comte. The second or *con*structive part cannot be represented in a sketch.

The article was not accepted for the *North British,* owing to an article on Comte in the same number having anticipated Spencer's offer. It appeared, however, in the *British Quarterly.*

Early in August he left town, intending to spend some months on the French coast and then to winter in Paris, devoting himself to the *Psychology.* But after a month

at Tréport his restlessness drove him to Paris, where he had not been many days, when, owing to the heat, he regretted that he "did not stay another week at Tréport." "I am getting on very well with the *Psychology*, which goes on unfolding into more and more complete form as I advance. From time to time I keep making fresh discoveries which harmonise with and confirm the rest. My private opinion is that it will ultimately stand beside Newton's *Principia.*" This opinion must have struck him as somewhat presumptuous, for twelve days after he tells his father that it will be well not to mention it lest it may be thought "a piece of vanity." Paris being too hot and too dull, by the middle of September he left for Jersey. He was "delighted with the island;" but "the cooking is not good." "They bake their meat instead of roasting it. However, by evading the questionable dishes I do pretty well, and as I do not think of staying more than a week longer it is not worth while to change." Early in October he was in Brighton. Taking lodgings "some distance from the sea, but high up on the West Cliff, overlooking the town," he expected to get on with his work. But by the 19th he was back in town with the intention of settling there for the winter.

The following extracts give some of the impressions received from this first visit to France.[1]

To Edward Lott.

14 *November*, 1854.

Two dinners a day (and the French *régime* may be properly so described) strikes one at first as rather queer

[1] Compare *Autobiography*, i., 531-5.

—especially the regiment of wine bottles at breakfast. But approval soon supplants surprise (at least it did with me) and I have come so far to prefer their system in respect of hours, that I have since adopted it. . . . Paris is a parasite, and considering how abnormal is its degree of development relatively to the rest of the body politic, and how disastrous to the nation at large is the perpetual abstraction of vitality by it, I do not feel in the least envious of its superiority in respect of the arts of life. Our efflorescence is to come; and based as it will be on an abundant nutrition, on a well organised nutritive system now in course of development, it will be both more complete and permanent.

Leaving all reflections, however, Paris is certainly a wonderful place. [But] it soon satiates. As for the architectural beauty of the place, it certainly makes one feel ashamed of London. Not that I think the architecture itself is really of a very superior order. It is rather by the amount of it and by the general regard to appearance that the effect is produced. Analysis of the public buildings and the house fronts leaves my opinion of French taste much as it was—by no means a high one. There is a certain poverty of conception, a mechanicalness in the designs—a formality, a lack of poetry. And there is frequently in the French buildings what I have often noticed in the French furniture—a want of that massiveness, that substantiality, which is a requisite basis of true beauty. . . . On Sunday, I went to the fête of St. Cloud. . . . One thing I saw astounded me not a little, and, little squeamish as I am likely to be on such a matter, somewhat shocked me. Fancy a *tableau vivant* of the *crucifixion* performed by three children—two boys and a girl, on a little revolving table in the midst of holiday-makers.

The article on "Railway Morals and Railway Policy" appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1854.

To his Father.

24 *October,* 1854.

The railway article is quite a success. *The Economist* and *Spectator* of this week have both leading articles upon it, approving the principle enunciated, and hinting at an alteration of the law. . . . The *Railway Times,* too, notifies that it has more extracts in type. These things render it probable that some result may arise from the article in a public point of view; and personally they will be very advantageous in putting me on a good footing with the *Edinburgh.*

19 *November.*—I have just been making such additions to the "Universal Postulate" and such divisions of it into parts as were needful to form it into the first part of my *Psychology*—the "General Analysis." I have made it clearer and stronger; and have met such objections as had been raised.

11 *March,* 1855.—It is sufficiently clear, therefore, that be the ultimate arrangement [for publishing the *Psychology*] what it may I shall not be able to get any sum paid down, to be forthcoming on the completion of the MS.

Such being the state of the case, and the American dividends not having been paid in cash, I shall soon be "hard up" if I stay here; and therefore propose, if you have no objection, to come down to Derby for a while, on the same terms as before.

15 *March.*—The printing is to commence forthwith. . . . Under this arrangement the printers will about overtake me by the time I get to the end, in June next, or thereabouts.

The next three months he spent at home, writing for five hours a day, with no relief from cogitation even during the hours devoted to walking. The portrait opposite shows that he was overworking himself. About the

HERBERT SPENCER.
From a photograph taken in 1855.

end of June he went to Wales to write the three concluding chapters. Pen-y-Gwyrid, at the foot of Snowdon, he calls (*Autobiography*, i., 543) "a place of sad memories to me; for it was here that my nervous system finally gave way." From this time the finishing of the *Psychology* was done by little bits at a time, some of it in Wales and the last chapter at home. To expedite publication he went to London, and by the middle of August the book was out.

To Alfred Tennyson.

1855.

I happened recently to be re-reading your Poem, "The Two Voices," and coming to the verse

> "Or if thro' lower lives I came—
> Tho' all experience past became
> Consolidate in mind and frame—"

it occurred to me that you might like to glance through a book which applies to the elucidation of mental science the hypothesis to which you refer. I therefore beg your acceptance of *Psychology*, which I send by this post.

To T. H. Huxley.

16 *August*, 1855.

Knowing as you must do how greatly I value your criticisms—much at my expense as they often are—I need hardly say how glad I shall be if when reading the book (or such portion of it as you have patience to read) you will jot down on the margin any remarks that occur to you, and will some day let me see them.

I have knocked myself up with hard work and am going to relax for six months. I start in the morning for Tréport on the French coast.

My best congratulations on the recent event [Professor Huxley's marriage] will be best conveyed by saying that I envy you.

Next morning he set out on that pursuit of health which was to last, not six months only, as he anticipated, but eighteen months, and which neither during that nor any future time was to be crowned with complete success. At Tréport, with Mr. Lott as companion, he made rapid progress; but, as usual, he soon tired of the place. He next tried Dover, but did not like it: "It is too much in a hole." Then Folkestone, where he "slept much better in consequence of having adopted a new course of regimen." He intended to move on to Hastings, but the next we hear of him (29 September) he is at Gloucester on his way to join Professor Huxley at Tenby, in the hope that "the going out with him dredging daily will do me good." It would be amusing, were it not so pathetic, to read how theory succeeded theory as to the abnormal condition of his brain, and remedy gave place to remedy; there being all the time a hopefulness which adverse experiences seemed unable to quench.

To his Father.

29 *September,* 1855.

The fact is, I have been making blood faster than the weakened blood vessels of my brain will bear, and I see that I must live low a while.

10 *October.*—Dr. Ransome might be right were the present state of my brain one of excess of circulation. But it is the reverse. Conversation with Huxley, joined with my own observations and deductions, have proved to me that the cause of my sleeplessness is *defect* of blood in the brain. All modes that excite the cerebral circulation (thinking excepted) are beneficial—stimulants, smoking, and so forth.

23 *October*.—I have come to the conclusion that the fault is not in the vessels of the brain but in the nervous substance. . . . I have no unusual sensation in my head unless I excite myself.

30 *October*.—I have come to the conclusion from sundry experiments of different kinds that tonics of all kinds are unfit for me at present, and that sea-air has been doing me harm rather than good. . . . Derby air will, I think, be suitable for a time.

After some five weeks at home, he went to live on a farm at Ideford, in Devonshire, the neighbourhood being favourable for riding, to which form of exercise he now took. From Devonshire he migrated to Gloucestershire, going first to Cirencester, where he found the air "bracing enough—almost too bracing at present, it would seem, for I have not slept so well since I came. I miss the horse exercise, which gives me exposure without much exertion." By January 20 he had taken up his abode at a farmhouse at Brimsfield, near Painswick, in Gloucestershire. The receipt of £67 for work done on some of Mr. Prichard's railway schemes years before, was "a very opportune windfall. I had long ago ceased to expect it." On February 7 he tells his mother: "I am getting on quite satisfactorily. I now take a great deal of exercise every day—walking, riding, and thrashing, which I find a very beneficial exercise." Next day, owing to the wet weather making "everything, indoors and out, insufferably damp," he resolved to go home. Home he went, but within three weeks he was back at Brimsfield. "By far the best exercise I have found yet is grubbing up tree-stumps and splitting them into pieces for burning. It is not simply exhausting exer-

cise, but it is interesting, and fully occupies the attention.'' Mr. Lewes chaffs him about this: '' And so you have become a hewer of wood and drawer of water! Is that the exodus of philosophy? ''

Among the remedies recommended by his friends at Standish were marriage and the exercise of the emotions, more especially the religious emotions. Parts of his replies to these suggestions are given in the *Autobiography* (i., 558-60). The letter to Mrs. Potter goes on to say:—

With respect to your special suggestion for the exercise of the feelings in default of a more direct means, I should say that it might be efficient in cases where the emotional part of the nature was already in a state of tolerable activity. But I have little faith in the effect of precept or example in a case like mine, where the feelings have been so long in an almost dormant state. Nothing but an actual presentation of the objects and circumstances to which they stand related will, I believe, suffice to excite them in any adequate manner. Moreover, there is in me a special hindrance to the production of any such effect as that you anticipate from reading the Gospels. Owing to the foolish pertinacity with which, as a child, I was weekly surfeited with religious teachings and observances, I have contracted a decided repugnance to the very forms in which they were conveyed. I cannot hear scriptural expressions without experiencing a certain disagreeable feeling; and I can no more escape this than I can the nausea produced in me by particular sweets that were commonly given me after medicine when a child. You will readily understand, therefore, that narrations clothed in language for which I have this distaste would fail in the desired result. Even were it otherwise I should doubt the practicability of efficiently arousing the *impersonal* emotions before the *personal* ones; the reverse is the natural order. And further, it is not as though your plan had never been

tried. Up to seventeen I was constantly in the way of hearing the Gosepls.

Mr. and Mrs. Potter were more successful in inducing him to try another remedy—a visit to Standish—which he accepted, though not without misgivings as to the effect of "cultivated Society" on his brain. He enjoyed himself greatly, participating especially in the amusements and recreations of the children. So great was the benefit that he thought of trying the effect of a visit to London. "I doubt not that rambling about London, sight-seeing, and occasionally calling on friends, will be just the thing for me."

He meant to economise during his stay in town, and not without reason: there being ground to fear that the *Psychology* would be a loss, and his pen had long been idle. The notices of the book, during the time he had been in retirement, did little to create a demand for it. The charge of "materialistic and atheistic," which the *Nonconformist* had brought against it, he repudiated. "Not only have I nowhere expressed any such conclusion, but I affirm that no such conclusion is deducible from the general tenor of the book. I hold, in common with most men who have studied the matter to the bottom, that the existence of a Deity can neither be proved nor disproved." The notice in the *National Review* he thought "decidedly dishonest. I am going to write a letter to the editor similar to that to the *Nonconformist.*"

To his Father.

Standish, 9 *April*, 1856.

You have probably heard what a scurvy notice the *Athenæum* has got of the *Psychology*. . . . The *National*

Review has declined to put in my letter. If I can get it back I shall publish it elsewhere.

I send you the *British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review* with a very good notice of the *Psychology*. It is by Morell.

London, 13 *April*.—Huxley has lately been reading the latter part of the *Psychology, à propos* of his lectures. He says "there are grand ideas in it." I value his approval more than that of any one; as he is always so critical and sceptical, and so chary of his praise.

2 *May*.—Bain,[1] who was excessively civil the other night, told me that John Mill spoke highly of the *Psychology*, and that he was preparing a reply to my attack on him, which is to appear in the 4th edition of his *Logic*.

The summer of 1856 was memorable as being the date of the first of many holidays spent at Achranich (afterwards Ardtornish), the Argyllshire home of Mr. Octavius Smith. On his way north he stopped for a week at Beoch, on the shore of Loch Doon, in Ayrshire, and put to the test some of his conclusions on the psychology of fishes.

To his Father.

Achranich, 16 *August*, 1856.

I received the enclosed note a few days since and the volumes [Mill's *Logic*] have now reached me. There is nearly a whole chapter devoted to a reply to the Universal Postulate. I have glanced through it, and am not at all alarmed. Nor does his reply on another point at all stagger me.

9 *September*.—I think it probable that I shall soon be able to do a little work daily; especially if the Brigh-

[1] This, his first meeting with Professor Bain, was at a party at Mrs. Masson's.

ton air suits me, as I expect it will. I have not caught a salmon yet; but I have hooked two.

Brighton not coming up to expectations, he made up his mind to go to Paris, and asked his father to send his skates, his map of Paris, and Nugent's dictionary.

To his Mother.

Paris, 20 *October,* 1856.

The weather here is bright and clear, and Paris looks more charming than ever.

I called on Comte yesterday to give him a remittance from Chapman. He is a very undignified little old man. My French sufficed me to carry on an argument with him in a very slipshod style.

Albeit that Paris was "more charming than ever," within a week he was tired of it. The idea of inventing a smoke-consuming fireplace had taken possession of him. "It is extremely simple, will possess very many advantages, and can, I think, scarcely fail to succeed. Moreover, the bringing it to bear will be a very good occupation for me, as being alike new and interesting."

To his Father.

London, 4 *November,* 1856.

I am busy getting information about smoke-consuming grates. Arnott's does not act perfectly, though it is an immense improvement. Moreover, it is liable to get out of order and difficult to manage. I am sanguine of success, and hope to combine many advantages besides smoke-consuming.

A day or two after this he went home, remaining till about Christmas. The smoke-consuming fireplace

" ended in smoke " he tells us. " Smoke would not behave as I expected it to do."

New Year's Day, 1857, was noteworthy as being the first of a long series of New Years' Days on which he dined with the Huxleys. To be near them he took up his abode with a family at 7, Marlborough Gardens, St. John's Wood, hoping to do a little work. Two years before this he had promised an article for the *Westminster Review* on " The Cause of All Progress." He now set about redeeming that promise.

To his Father.

4 *February*, 1857.

I am attending a course of Huxley's lectures at the Royal Institution, to which he has given me a ticket. I was lately present at Dr. Tyndall's lecture on glaciers, in which he overturned sundry of the current theories.

23 *March*.—I finished my article on " Progress " on Saturday. I have been rather hard pressed for these ten days. . . . On the whole, I have decidedly progressed with this hard work.

The article was " very well received," he writes in May. " Huxley, whose criticism I value most, said he could not pick a hole in it, and that he meant to read it two or three times. He thought it would have great results on science." For the next few months he was engaged on an article for the *National Review* on " Transcendental Physiology," which appeared under the title " The Ultimate Laws of Physiology." Huxley told him that it had been ascribed to Huxley himself; " and that by no less a person than Dr. Hooker. I have heard Huxley say that there are but four philosophical

naturalists in England—Darwin, Busk, Hooker, and himself. Thus the article has been ascribed *by* one of the four *to* another of the four."

The midsummer holiday of 1857 was spent in Kirkcudbrightshire and Ayrshire. While there he elaborated into an article for *Fraser's Magazine* some notes previously made on "The Origin and Function of Music." Discovering on the way south that he would arrive at Derby on a Sunday evening, he wrote to his mother: "I believe there are no cabs at the Derby station on Sunday. Will you therefore please send one to the station to be there ready for me at 7.35. For with my fishing basket and rod, and my somewhat dilapidated costume, I shall hardly like walking up home." During the few weeks at home he began an article on "Representative Government," which was completed at Standish. He was back in town in time for its appearance in the *Westminster* in October.

To his Father.

London, 28 *November,* 1857.

I have undertaken to write a short article on this Banking Crisis—perhaps under the title of the Bunglings of State-banking—in which I propose showing the evils of meddling and the superiority of an unrestricted system. It is for the next *Westminster.*

I have also engaged to supply the April number of the *British Quarterly* with an essay on "The Moral Discipline of Children."

I have just revised the last sheet but one of the volume of *Essays.* It will be out, probably, by the end of this next week.

CHAPTER VIII

THE UNIFICATION OF KNOWLEDGE

(*January*, 1858—*May*, 1860)

One of the reasons which weighed with Spencer in selecting 13, Loudoun Road, St. John's Wood, as his residence in the beginning of 1858 was its nearness to Professor Huxley. Henceforth their intercourse became more frequent, and whether or not they met during the week, the Sunday afternoon walk could be looked forward to for healthy exercise and mental stimulation.

The revision of the *Essays* towards the close of the previous year was doubtless the immediate cause of that synthesis of his thoughts which, to outward appearance, suddenly took place during the last days of 1857 and the first days of 1858. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that the scheme, dated January 6, 1858, which he forwarded to his father on the 9th, was hastily conceived. Towards such a synthesis his ideas had for years been tending, the general drift of thought in the scientific world being also in the direction of some unifying principle. In his writings, varied as they had been in subject-matter and treatment, there could be traced a fundamentally uniform method of looking at every problem, as well as many of the leading conceptions embodied in the scheme. The revision of the *Essays* was but the completing link in the chain of antecedents.

Note.—*Autobiography*, ii., chaps. xxx., xxxi., xxxii.

While thinking over his project he had to fulfil engagements already entered into, such as the article for the *British Quarterly* on the "Moral Discipline of Children." An article on "Physical Training" was proposed for the *Quarterly Review*, and one on the "Nebular Hypothesis" was begun.

To his Father.

1 *April*, 1858.

I am very well, and am going on satisfactorily with my article for the *Quarterly*. I think it will be interesting.

I happened to meet at Chapman's on Sunday a Captain Pelly [afterwards Sir Lewis Pelly], and through him received a most flattering and rather startling compliment. After expressing his own obligations to me for instruction derived from *Social Statics*, he went on to say that it was much read by the officers on the northern frontier of India—that they had a dozen copies in circulation among them—and that *Colonel Jacob, the Chief Commissioner in Scinde, who is in fact the Governor of Scinde, swears by it, and acts completely on its principles.* This Colonel Jacob has just written a book which his friend Captain Pelly has brought out for him in England, in which he gives his political experiences illustrating these doctrines to which he has been converted. I little thought that *Social Statics* was already regulating the government of some millions of people.

He had promised to accompany his father to France for the next midsummer holiday. But when the time drew near he hesitated owing to the warlike preparations going on across the channel.

To his Father.

14 *June*, 1858.

What *do* all these enormous preparations mean? An attack on England seems improbable; but every other

conceivable purpose seems equally improbable. As the preparations *must* mean something the question is, of the various improbabilities, which is the least improbable. Certainly nothing would delight the army more than to attack us. I saw not long since a copy of verses that are sung by the French soldiers, breathing most ferocious feelings against us. Louis Napoleon would not hesitate if he thought it politic; but can he think it politic? I do not know what to think.

18 *June*.—It seems very probable that I shall be prevented from joining you myself. There is an arbitration case of Prichard's just coming on, in which I am wanted as witness; and if I can get paid my last account for similar services, due now these five years, I must stay to give evidence. It is provoking that things should so happen as to hinder this long-arranged joint excursion.

The next three months were spent for the most part in his native county. With Derby as his headquarters he made excursions hither and thither in the vain hope of getting fishing. At Matlock, "where the fishing is free there being no fish!" he made up for the want of his favourite pastime by attacking the theory of the vertebrate skeleton. His dissatisfaction with the Archetype theory dated from 1851, when he attended Owen's lectures. A lecture by Professor Huxley, showing the inadequacy of Owen's doctrine in so far as it concerns the skull, encouraged him to express his disbelief in the theory as a whole. "I am busy," says a letter (9 July) "with the onslaught on Owen. I find on reading, the 'Archetype and Homologies' is terrible bosh—far worse than I had thought. I shall make a tremendous smash of it, and lay the foundations of a true theory on its ruins." The month after the article appeared he writes

to his father: "Huxley tells me that the article on Owen has created a sensation. He has had many questions put to him respecting the authorship—being himself suspected by some. The general opinion was that it was a settler."

On return to town in October he set about writing a promised article on "The Laws of Organic Forms." In view of another article he mentions that he was to "dine with Mr. Cross, of the great firm of Dennistoun, Cross and Co. He is to give me some information bearing on the morals of trade." An article on "Physical Training," declined for the *Quarterly*, had been accepted for the *British Quarterly*. He had been distributing a few volumes of the *Essays*. Two of the letters of acknowledgment are worth quoting, Mr. Darwin's being one to which Spencer attached great importance.

From Charles Darwin.

25 *November* [1858].

Your remarks on the general argument of the so-called Development Theory seem to me admirable. I am at present preparing an abstract of a larger work on the changes of species; but I treat the subject simply as a naturalist, and not from a general point of view; otherwise, in my opinion, your argument could not have been improved on, and might have been quoted by me with great advantage.[1]

From Thomas Henry Buckle.

3 *December*, 1858.

Rarely, very rarely, have I read a volume containing so much thought. Indeed, some of your views almost

[1] *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, i., 497. *Autobiography*, ii., 32.

trouble me with their wealth—the ideas, in spite of their clearness, being so suggestive as to fatigue. But to oppress in this way is the highest proof of power. . . . The one on Progress interested me much; but you would doubtless be the first to allow that our knowledge is hardly ripe enough to verify the whole generalisation it contains.

While at home he had been turning over in his mind plans for securing a living while giving him leisure to carry on his literary work. The re-organisation of the Administration of India having suggested a possible solution, he wrote to Mr. J. S. Mill.[1] Application was also made for a post under the Education Commission. And, in addition, Mr. Octavius Smith had some plan which, if carried out, would give him a position in Mr. Chapman's firm. The letter to Mr. Mill, owing to the death of Mrs. Mill, did not reach its destination till November, when he was favoured with a reply which "though sympathetic, was disappointing," as far as prospect of employment was concerned.

To J. S. Mill.

Richmond, 27 *November*, 1858.

I hardly know how adequately to thank you for your very generous letter; and my difficulty is increased by the remembrance of the sad circumstances under which it is written. . . .

I have scarcely any claim to express my sympathy with you. But I cannot refrain from saying that I hope, both on public and private grounds, that the depression which the opening of your letter implies, may not be lasting; and that you may hereafter resume your career of usefulness.

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 28.

The expression of opinion with which your letter concludes is much stronger than I had hoped, and cannot fail, if I may make use of it, to be of great service.

Among the friends whose interest he sought to enlist was Dr. Hooker.

To J. D. Hooker.

13 *December*, 1858.

I am about to seek some such position as that of foreign consul; and my purpose in seeking it is to obtain the means of prosecuting various literary (or more properly, scientific) projects which I am now unable to carry out.

What I have hitherto written bears but a small ratio to that which I am anxious to write. Aims, originally somewhat extensive, have been gradually growing more so. Especially of late certain ideas, of which a few crude, misshapen rudiments exist in the *Essays*, have been developing in a way I never anticipated—promising in great measure to absorb, and give unity to, the separate works I had before contemplated. And this has made me the more eager to go on.

But, unhappily for me, my books have no adequate sale. . . . Under these circumstances the course suggested to me is to obtain, if possible, some post, rather of responsibility than of much active duty, which would afford me adequate leisure for executing the contemplated works. . . . .

If you believe it is desirable to treat Psychology and Sociology after the spirit and methods of physical science (I give this as the best brief indication of my chief aim) —and if you believe, from what you see of my writings, that I am likely to achieve anything in this direction, perhaps you will add the weight of your name to that of others. I am desirous to have the matter considered solely on public grounds. If you think that, through the

advancement of opinion, an adequate public advantage would probably result from my gaining the desired position, and if, *in so far only as you think this,* you could aid me by your testimony, you would do all that I wish, and would much oblige.

In the matter of consular appointments, Dr. Hooker's reply was not encouraging.

They do entail an amount of worry to a sensitive and duty-loving man that is far from congenial to reflection. . . . I hence question whether some post demanding the veriest drudgery and nothing else, during work-hours, would not prove more suited to your pursuits, so long as the said drudgery was limited as to time per day and entailed no after cares. . . . This is teaching the teacher with a vengeance, for no one should know all this so well as you; but no man can be his own physician or metaphysician either!

When inviting the opinions of his friends, he had been careful to state that he wished this question of an appointment to be treated solely on public grounds. The testimonials he received laid stress, therefore, on the public value of his work as a thinker and writer, the importance of giving him the means and leisure to carry it on, and the possession by him of the intellectual and moral qualifications that go to make a valuable public servant. Here are a few extracts from the testimonials.

Mr. J. S. Mill.—I should think it a credit to any minister to obtain the aid of abilities and principles like yours for the public service, and an absolute disgrace not to avail himself of them when offered.

Dr. R. G. Latham.—I have no hesitation in committing myself to the opinion that any position which gave

you leisure and opportunity for continuing your labours in the direction in which they already lie, would be a benefit not only to a limited number of readers, but to the national literature and science in general.

Dr. J. D. Hooker.—I have been deeply impressed with your accurate and extensive information, your vast power of acquiring knowledge, and the sagacity with which you analyse and generalise the facts and ideas which lie at the foundations of both the Natural and Physical Sciences. Nor are you less happy in your manner of expounding your results than in your methods of arriving at them. . . . In common with all your friends, my great desire is to see you placed in some responsible position, where you could devote a fair share of your time to the solution of the great problems that occupy your attention, feeling assured as I do, that wherever you may be placed, your love of these sciences, your power of observation and reflection, and your ability and promptness in treating of them, will lead to your developing results of the greatest importance to the advance of human knowledge and happiness.

Mr. George Grote.—I feel assured that your services are likely to prove extremely valuable in any department of administration to which you may be named; not merely from such a combination of intellectual study with knowledge of practical details, but also from that uprightness, sincerity of character, and habit of diligent industry, which I know you to possess besides.

Professor Campbell Fraser.—I am happy to give my testimony to his power of invigorating and inspiring other minds. . . . I should anticipate a salutary impulse to surrounding opinion wherever he may be placed, from his fearless investigations, as well as valuable results to science from his habits of unbiassed and laborious interpretations of phenomena.

Sir Henry Holland.—I am very desirous to aid, in any way that may be in my power, the desire you express to obtain some office under Government. I may in part

perhaps do this by writing a few lines to convey my opinion of your eminent fitness for any position, in which high honour and integrity are required; conjoined with equally high intelligence and mental cultivation.

Professor Huxley.—Founded as it is upon the accurate observation of facts, science would soon stagnate if the co-ordination of its data did not accompany their accumulation—and I can conceive nothing that would give a more vigorous impulse to the progress of science than the promulgation of a modern "novum organon" adapted to the state of knowledge in these days, and showing the unity of method of all science and the mutual connexion and interdependence of all forms of cognition.

I cannot testify more strongly to my estimation of Mr. Spencer's abilities, than by expressing my belief that if health and moderate leisure be granted him, he will very satisfactorily perform this necessary piece of work for us.

Professor Tyndall.—It gives me pleasure to state that in your writings I discern the working of a rarely gifted and a rarely furnished mind. I do not know that I have met anywhere a deeper and truer spirit of research. Your facts are legion, and your power of dealing with them . . . is to me almost without a parallel. . . . I would here express the earnest hope that circumstances may be so shaped as to enable you to apply powers of the rarest order, and knowledge which it must have required long years of labour to attain, in its advancement and propagation.

Of the letters of thanks two only have been found—namely, to Dr. Hooker and Professor Huxley.

To J. D. Hooker.

16 *December,* 1858.

Thank you very heartily for your valuable testimonial, and the sympathetic expressions accompanying it. Of

the one let me say that it is quite the kind of thing I wanted, but much better than I had dared to hope. . . .

My reason for choosing this [a foreign consulship] as the direction in which to seek an appointment was partly because I thought the requisite leisure would thus be secured, and partly because the office is one which I could undertake consistently with my views on the limits of State-duty. But your remarks give me pause. . . .

I looked for you last night at the meeting of the Geological Society, wishing to thank you in person, but I could not see you. The evening was a triumph for Huxley, and rather damaging for the progressive theory, *as commonly held.*

To T. H. Huxley.

31 *December,* 1858.

I scarcely know how adequately to thank you for your most cordial testimonial. It far surpasses what I had hoped. . . .

I had no idea that you had so far divined my aim; though you have given to it an expression that I had never thought of doing. I know that I have sometimes dropped hints; but my ambition has of late been growing so wide that I have not dared fully to utter it to anyone. But that, having in some sort recognised it, you, who so well know my weak points, should still think that I may do something towards achieving it, is, I assure you, an immense satisfaction, and will be to me a great encouragement to persevere.

Though I fear few will realise the possibility, or at any rate probability, that results of value may arise from giving me the opportunity of working out my aims, yet that one in your position should express this conviction cannot fail to be of important service to me.

In pursuance of his idea of getting some post in connection with India he had applied to Lord Stanley, who, as well as Mr. Disraeli, expressed a desire to help him.

From Lord Stanley.

East India House, 4 *January*, 1859.

I have long been familiar with your works on *Psychology* and *Social Statics*, and accept with pleasure the copies which you send, although I have already other copies in my library. Having read these works with close attention, I require no further proof of your qualification in point of intellectual ability for public service; and I should be glad to be able to secure for the State the advantage of your talents and assiduity. But it is fair to inform you that the amount at my disposal of what is called "patronage" is but small. . . . My power of furthering your wishes is therefore very limited; but if you will state to what particular branch of the service your wishes point, I shall be better able to say whether I see any prospect of being able to offer you employment.

To his Mother.

28 *March*, 1859.

A few days ago I was much disheartened in consequence of finding, in the course of a conversation with Mr. Wilson, that there were now very few posts that would at all suit me—very few that would give adequate leisure. . . . The only posts that Mr. Wilson thought would be available were those of stamp-distributors.

These endeavours to find employment interfered with the article on "The Morals of Trade," which was not finished till January. At home for a few weeks he began a paper on the relative values of the different kinds of knowledge. He also made his first regular experiment in dictation in the shape of a memorial from his father to the Town Council about the houses in Bridgegate.

To J. S. Mill.

Derby, 17 *February,* 1859.

I should ere this have thanked you very much (as I now do) for the copy of your Essay *On Liberty,* which you have been so kind as to send me.

In recent times the topic has been so much disgraced by clap-trap declamation and the questionable characters of those who have dealt with it, that it has become one apt to call up more or less derision in the minds of a large class of people. And greatly needing as it did to be rescued from its damaging associations, I rejoice that it has been taken up by one whose name will beget for it respectful consideration.

I am very glad, too, that you should have treated that aspect of the matter which so greatly needs exposition —the claims of the individual *versus* those of society. Unfortunately, the notion of liberty has been so much mixed up with that of organic reforms, that, with the mass of men, it has come to be synonymous with democratic government; and many of those who think themselves its warmest advocates are above all others inclined to increase the tyranny of the State over individuals. Indeed, the strong tendency there is on the part of the working classes to Over-Legislate has given me the only qualms I have had of late years respecting the effects of increased popular power.

You do not carry the assertion of private against public claims quite so far as I do. But though as a matter of theory I could have wished for something further, yet, considered with reference to its influence, I am glad your Essay asserts no more than it does: it will have the greater weight with almost all readers. I hope for great effects from it in mitigating that mania for meddling which has been the curse of recent legislation. And I know of no more important service to the time than to reform public opinion in this matter.

The next letter acknowledges a copy of the pamphlet on Parliamentary Reform.

To J. S. Mill.

London, 25 *March*, 1859.

I scarcely know what to say respecting an educational qualification; but on the whole my leanings are, I think, rather towards dissent than otherwise. Setting aside practical difficulties, which I expect would be considerable, I doubt whether education, of the elementary kind, is a trustworthy test of the intelligence requisite to give a vote. The mass of those who have the mere rudiments of education, are, I believe, as profoundly ignorant of all matters bearing on legislation as those who cannot read and write. By-and-bye, perhaps, as cheap newspapers spread, it may become otherwise; but at present I fancy this is the case. Moreover, the sprinkling of artisans who have made some use of their education, and are politically active, would not improbably make worse voters [rather] than better. If the rest know *nothing*, the knowledge of these consists chiefly of *error*. Preferring publications that promise them impossible advantages, and reading only these, they contract some of the wildest hopes and will listen to no criticism of them; and very generally their desire for political power originates in the determination to enact their utopias. The present strike of the shoemakers (an intelligent body of artisans) against the sewing-machine shows that, *relatively to social phenomena*, they are no wiser than peasants.

I merely set down these considerations at random—not having thought out the question carefully.

Respecting the ballot I own to being very much shaken, if not indeed converted.

May I draw your attention to a point in the representation which seems to me of more importance than any other? I mean the propriety of insisting that those who have votes shall personally pay rates. The tendency

of late has been exactly in the opposite direction. Small householders have been more and more freed from direct taxes, without diminishing their political power. Some years since they were disfranchised when their landlords compounded for the rates; but now it is otherwise. The result is that the connexion between all governmental action and the demand for taxes—a connexion far too faintly realised even under the most favourable circumstances—is becoming less and less familiar to the working class mind. The result is necessarily an increased leaning towards over-legislation. This is now conspicuously the case in municipal governments. The municipal taxes being paid by the landlords of small houses, and the tenants being not reminded by increased rates that they have to pay for extra municipal outlay, it has now become in towns the popular policy to make public gardens, and build public baths, &c., at the town's expense: the popular candidate gains suffrages by promising these things. If all the men who had political power had constantly thrust upon them, in a quite distinct, tangible manner, the fact that for every additional function undertaken by the Government, general or local, they had to pay so much the more money, there would be an efficient check upon interference. I feel very much inclined to think *that representation may be safely extended so fast only* as taxation becomes direct and equitably distributed.

A paper on Geology was dictated during a six weeks' sojourn at home before going to Achranich. The following are extracts from letters to his parents while he was in Argyllshire.

21 *July*.—They are all very kind, and everything goes on very agreeably. The weather is very fine and the scenery magnificent.

7 *August.*—As I did before, I find this air rather enervating. But I am sleeping well and enjoying myself greatly. . . .

This is a capital place for studying geology, and especially the geology of metamorphic rocks. There is an immense variety of formations within a small area.

4 *September.*—Mrs. Smith has pressed me to stay as long as I find it agreeable. . . . I am pretty well, but am rendered rather stupid by this damp climate.

13 *September.*—Valentine Smith, with whom I was intending to come south, does not start till Tuesday, and they have persuaded me to stay till he leaves. . . .

We yesterday had the most charming excursion I ever had in my life. We went by sea—a boat containing twelve—down the Sound of Mull, up Loch Sunart and Loch Teacuis, and home by land. The scenery was splendid and the colouring marvellous. The day was one I shall never forget.

He had got over the dread of society experienced during the eighteen months following the writing of the *Psychology*. Thus he writes (14 November) :—

Along with some others I supped with Hepworth Dixon, the editor of the *Athenæum,* on Tuesday. . . . I dined with Sir J. Trelawney on Saturday; and at Massons' last night. Notwithstanding which, I am very well to-day. I am . . . feeling as usual the benefits of London. I think it not improbable that the *dryness* of the London air, from there being so many miles of paved and roofed surface, is the cause of its salubrity.

All this was favourable to work. In addition to a review of Bain's *The Emotions and the Will,* he finished an article on the " Social Organism," and began one on

" Prison Ethics." For *Macmillan's Magazine,* to which Mr. Masson had asked him to contribute, he thought of writing on " The Physics of Physiology," but took instead " The Physiology of Laughter." When, many years after, he came upon the letter to his father in which this projected paper on the " Physics of Physiology " is mentioned, he appended to it the following note:—

I did not know that the conception of such an article dated so far back; but I have often since thought the topic one which deserved special treatment. Indeed, there is ample scope for a large work dealing with this division of biology. The mass of medical men are generally very ignorant of physics, and either misinterpret or fail to interpret many simple physiological phenomena from the absence of fit knowledge. . . . A want of knowledge as thus illustrated is, as I say, very general, and there needs a scientific setting forth of all such organic processes as come under ordinary physical laws. . . . This scheme for an essay on " The Physics of Physiology," which has an immense number of applications, was for some reason not carried out. I suppose it must have been that other essays took precedence of it.

By the beginning of 1860 he had given up all hope of obtaining an appointment that would make his livelihood secure and at the same time allow him the leisure necessary for writing a system of philosophy. Most men in these circumstances would have given up further attempts to combine ends apparently so incompatible, and would have sacrificed philosophy. Not so Herbert Spencer. In a letter to his father, dated January 20, after mentioning that he had agreed to write an article for the *Westminster* on " Reform—the Danger and the Safe-

guard," he adds: "I shall send you something that will surprise you in a few days." This referred to the programme of the *System of Philosophy*. A printed copy bears a note in his handwriting: "Do not let this be seen at present. I want to take some opinions on it before finally issuing it." With some verbal differences it is the same as the programme given in Appendix A of the *Autobiography*. Only in place of the first sentence as finally adopted one reads: "In most cases writers of philosophical books who are unable to bear heavy losses, or have already lost what they had to lose, must either be silent or must publish by subscription. The last alternative Mr. Spencer proposes to adopt rather than leave unwritten a connected series of works which he has for several years been elaborating."

From the replies to his circular the following are a few pertinent extracts.

Mr. R. Chambers.—It is certainly a very grand design, such as few living men could have grappled with, or even conceived. If you execute it in a manner at all attractive you will obtain a great fame.

Mr. H. T. Buckle.—I am so sensible of the value of what you are doing that you may rely on my co-operation as far as my power extends.

Mr. J. A. Froude.—May it (the projected work) answer all the questions which your prospectus suggests. Your first proposition I confess myself unable to understand. Mansel says his absolute is the unknowable. How by following out his reasonings you are to establish a belief in it, I am curious to see. . . . But, by all means, let us hear what you have to say.

Sir John Herschel.—I could wish you had not adopted in the very outset of your programme the Shib-

boleth of the Hegel and Schelling School of German Philosophy, " The Absolute."

Rev. Charles Kingsley.—Anything from your pen will be important to me; and from your programme you are facing the whole matter from that side from which it *must* be faced, sooner or later.

Sir Charles Lyell.—I hope you will not consider it impertinent in me to remark that I regret the first four lines of your printed programme. There is nothing in your writings and style to entitle even a hostile critic to raise up images of " heavy losses " and unsaleability in your future projected works.

F. W. Newman.—It must surely tend to public enlightenment that the works of one who has thought so continuously should appear in a continuous shape, provided only that you do not become too voluminous.

From Charles Darwin.

2 [*February,* 1860.]

From your letter I infer that you have not received a copy of my book, which I am very sorry for. I told Mr. Murray to send you one, *amongst the first distributed* in November. . . . I have now written a preface for the foreign editions and for any future English edition (should there be one), in which I give a very brief sketch [of the progress of opinion], and have with much pleasure alluded to your excellent essay on Development in your general Essays.

To Edward Lott.

10 *February,* 1860.

Have you got a copy of the " Theory of Population," and if so, can you find it? I have no copy left save one that is cut into parts for future use.

I am just reading Darwin's book (a copy of which has been searching for me since November and has only just come to hand) and want to send him the " Population "

to show how thoroughly his argument harmonises with that which I have used at the close of that essay.

I shall shortly be sending you something which will surprise you.

At the foot of a copy of this letter Spencer has noted: "This makes it clear that the programme of the 'System of Philosophy,' *in its finished form* was drawn up before I read the *Origin of Species.*" Along with the pamphlet on "Population," he sent Mr. Darwin a note, acknowledging the *Origin of Species,* and apparently remarking on it.

FROM CHARLES DARWIN.

23 [*February,* 1860].

I write one line to thank you much for your note. Of my numerous (private) critics, you are almost the only one who has put the philosophy of the argument, as it seems to me, in a fair way—namely, as an hypothesis (with some innate probability, as it seems to me) which explains several groups of facts.[1]

You put the case of selection in your pamphlet on Population in a very striking and clear manner.

The issue of the programme seemed a favourable opportunity for carrying out the intention, expressed some years before, of trying to introduce his books to the American public. The response from an American friend, Mr. Silsbee, though somewhat vague, was not discouraging. In a subsequent letter from the same correspondent, Mr. Edward Livingston Youmans is for the first time brought to Spencer's notice. Mr. Youmans's interest had been awakened some years before on read-

[1] See also *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin,* ii., 84.

ing a notice of the *Principles of Psychology.* No sooner had he read Spencer's circular and programme than he wrote (February 23) a letter—the first of a long and important series—full of enthusiasm and promising hearty co-operation. He wished to include, in a book he was about to bring out, two of Spencer's educational articles, and deeply regretted Spencer's refusal, " as it took from me the instrument upon which I prospectively and chiefly relied for advancement of your larger enterprise. Upon taking hold of the matter I encounter the difficulty which I anticipated: it is that you are almost unknown to the people."[1]

The article on " Parliamentary Reform: the Dangers and Safeguards " was published in April, and that on " Prison Ethics " in July. The former was the last of the essays written for the Quarterly Reviews prior to the commencement of his great undertaking. About the writing of it he says in a memorandum:

It was, moreover, the most rapidly written article which I ever published. At the time I had engaged an amanuensis who could write shorthand, and who during the pauses of my dictation was in the habit of transcribing his shorthand into long-hand. This, of course, was a considerable economy of time; and I remember observing that I then achieved a page of print per hour—a rate of composition which I never before nor after equalled.

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans,* pp. 104-110.

CHAPTER IX

FIRST PRINCIPLES

(*May*, 1860—*February*, 1863)

THE following letter marks the beginning of what was described by Mrs. Huxley as the long path he had marked out for himself to travel.

TO HIS FATHER.

18 TORRINGTON SQUARE,
8 *May*, 1860.

I am fixed as above pretty comfortably. I began writing yesterday, and did better than I expected. Number of subscribers is now 280. Holyoake's are coming in; and I doubt not I shall get 350 *without America*.

He had not been many days at work when bad nervous symptoms drove him to Brighton for a few days. The month following he wrote, backing out of the arrangement previously made to join his father at Tréport for the holidays. "Health is the first consideration, especially under my present engagements; and I am very decidedly of opinion that I shall benefit more by joining Lott's party at Llandudno than by going to France. . . . Add to which that it will be more economical, which just now is a consideration." Eventually, putting economy aside, he did both; spent first a short

NOTE.—*Autobiography*, ii., chaps. xxxiii., xxxiv.

time at Llandudno and then joined his father and mother at Tréport, returning to London in July. News from the United States was encouraging; putting him at ease as to the financial aspect of his undertaking. In a list of some of the earlier American subscribers one meets the names of George Bancroft, Henry Ward Beecher, Henry W. Bellows, F. Bowen, J. I. Bowditch, Henry C. Cary, E. H. Chapin, George W. Curtis, J. W. Draper, Edward Everett, C. C. Felton, John W. Francis, Dr. Furness, Walcott Gibbs, Asa Gray, Horace Greeley, E. E. Hale, Geo. S. Hillard, F. H. Hodge, Francis Lieber, J. R. Lowell, W. B. Rogers, Jared Sparks, Charles Sumner, Bayard Taylor, George Ticknor, E. P. Whipple, Jeffries Wyman.

On his way to Achranich in September he spent a few days at home. The first of the two following extracts acknowledges the return of proofs of *First Principles,* the second gives expression to his sympathy on the occasion of a domestic bereavement.[1]

To T. H. Huxley.

Derby, 11 *September,* 1860.

I was, as you may suppose, immensely gratified to have from you so decided an expression of approval. Coming from you, who are so critical and sceptical, it took me somewhat by surprise; and the more so because I feared that this first part would prove a choke-pear to the subscribers. Judge, then, how great a relief it was to read your letter.

Achranich, 23 *September.*—I sincerely sympathise with you and your wife in your great loss, knowing as

[1] *Life of Professor Huxley,* i., 228-229.

I do how much you prized your little boy. I well remember your having told me how his existence had disclosed to you a new side of your nature, previously dormant; and I can well understand how one, feeling so deeply the interests of parenthood, not only on their instinctive, but on their rational side, must be affected by such a catastrophe.

He would not allow Professor Huxley or Dr. Hooker to remain as paying subscribers, for the reason given in a letter of 6 October, 1860. "I have all along calculated on obtaining from you much aid in the shape of information, advice, and criticism; and may, I fear, if you will allow me, from time to time, trouble you a good deal with questions and discussions. Though in such a case a pepper-corn acknowledgement, in the shape of a presentation copy, leaves the obligation just where it was, yet there is a certain satisfaction in going through the form of an acknowledgement; and this satisfaction you must not deny me."[1]

To Mrs. Potter.

London, 25 *October*, 1860.

Have you seen the volume of Essays by Jowett and Co.? They appear to be creating a considerable sensation. As coming from some of the most influential men connected with the Church, they are extremely significant of the progress of opinion. . . .

By the way, referring to matters bearing upon the current theology, let me horrify you by the announce-

[1] Professor Huxley's letter of 10th October, 1860 (*Life and Letters*, i., 214) is in reply to the above letter. His biographer, when referring to the circumstances in which the letter was written, was misled, owing to Spencer having, through oversight, endorsed on the letter that it was written in 1866, when he had issued a notice of discontinuance.

ment of a recent discovery. There has just been sent over from Germany to Sir Charles Lyell the cast of a "skull, found along with the bones of the mammoth and other extinct mammals which lived during the period of the drift," or latest geologic epoch. And this skull, which, judging from the remains with which it is found, was contemporaneous with those flint implements which have lately been creating so great a sensation, by proving the vast antiquity of the human race—this skull, mark, *is intermediate between that of the gorilla and that of man!* There is a startling fact for you.

After this, anything else would be bathos, so I will leave off. With kindest regards to Mr. Potter and the little girls.

He was afraid that the delay in the issue of the first number of the serial might prejudice his interests in the United States, but Dr. Youmans set his mind at rest on that score.

From Edward Livingston Youmans.

6 *October,* 1860.

I was anxious to get the volume on Education out at the earliest moment, before the first part of the serial arrives. We don't exactly know about that "Unknowable," we have great faith in it, undoubtedly; but we are sure of the weapon in hand and prefer to open the campaign with that. I therefore by no means regret the delay of the first part, nor need you trouble yourself to hasten the sending of it now.[1]

Hardly had he settled down to work when he was summoned to Derby, owing to the illness of his uncle William—an illness which had a fatal termination towards the end of November. The legacy left by his

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans,* p. 112.

uncle put him in possession of funds likely to be needed if his literary project was to be carried out. The number of subscribers, if it could be kept up, would suffice to pay the cost of publication and yield him a small income—provided there were no defaulters. But it would not prove sufficient if there came a falling away of subscribers and bad debts. Even already there were indications that there might be difficulty in meeting the printer's bill, to say nothing of earning a living. The legacy came, therefore, at an opportune time.

Early in 1861 the second number was issued, and "so far as I have at present heard, meets with high approval." He mentions that he was "attending various lectures—seven this week," leading his father to fear a break-down. No letters between February 13 and June 14 are to be found; but one gathers from the *Autobiography* (ii., 69) that coincident with the bringing out of No. 3 of the serial there was a relapse; that he sought relaxation in visits to Standish and Derby; and that during these visits he revised the articles on Education, which he saw through the Press in May and June. As usual, he improved at Achranich (or Ardtornish, as his friend's Argyllshire home was now called) in July and August, and looked forward to being "able to go ahead with the work on return." This expectation was not realised; for soon after arriving in town the strain of bringing out his fourth instalment proved too much. By the middle of October he was contemplating going to Paris, where "change of air, change of scene, entire relaxation, and plenty of amusement, will, I hope, soon set me right." The *Autobiography* makes no mention of this visit, and beyond a reference to letters written in

Paris on November 5 and 15, the above is the only hint of it. That it answered his expectations for a time at least may be inferred from a letter, dated Torrington Square, December 12, in which he says: "I am improving considerably; and have done a fair share of work this week without detriment." Early in 1862 we find him in Bloomsbury Square, which is, he fears, "too far away from the most of my friends."

In May he tells his father: "The chapter on 'Equilibration,' which I am now revising, works out beautifully; but it is giving me a good deal of trouble." "Equilibration" had been giving him trouble for several years. In an undated letter to Professor Tyndall from 13, Loudoun Road, written probably towards the end of 1858 or very early in the year following, he says:—

Had not the announcement of coffee prevented, I had hoped to carry much further the discussion we commenced on Saturday evening. Lest you should misunderstand me, let me briefly say now what I wished to say.

In the first place, I fully recognise, and have all along recognised, the tendency to ultimate equilibrium; and have, after sundry other chapters on the general laws of change, a final one entitled "The Equilibration of Force." Indeed, of the general views which I have of late years been working out, this was oddly enough the first reached. Among memoranda jotted down for a second edition of *Social Statics*—memoranda written towards the close of '51, or early in '52—I have some bearing on this law in its application to society. . . . Thus, you see, that my views commit me most fully to the doctrine of ultimate equilibration.

That which was new to me in your position enunciated

last June, and again on Saturday, was that equilibration was death. Regarding, as I had done, equilibration as the ultimate and *highest* state of society, I had assumed it to be not only the ultimate but also the highest state of the universe. And your assertion that when equilibrium was reached life must cease, staggered me. Indeed, not seeing my way out of the conclusion, I remember being out of spirits for some days afterwards. I still feel unsettled about the matter, and should like some day to discuss it with you.[1]

The completed volume was published the third week of June, when he gave himself up to relaxation, acting as guide at the International Exhibition to his parents and others. This summer's visit to Scotland, whither he went after two weeks in Wales, is described with more than usual fulness in the *Autobiography* (ii., 89-96), owing probably to its having been mainly a walking tour. Of the scenery from Invergarry to Loch Alsh he writes: "I have seen some magnificent scenery—the finest I have seen in the kingdom." This enjoyable tour was made shorter than he intended by the arrival from New York of Dr. and Mrs. Youmans, whom he arranged to meet in Glasgow. After a few days spent with them, he went South, taking Derby and Coventry on the way, London being reached by the middle of September.

While away he had been on the look-out for notices of his book. "No reviews of *First Principles* have reached me yet," he writes in July. "It is a book that reviewers are glad to put off as long as they can." October brought several notices: among them the article on "Science, Nescience, and Faith," in the *National Review* for October, which is thus referred to:—

[1] See Appendix. "The Filiation of Ideas."

To his Father.

9, Gloucester Square,
3 *October*, 1862.

It is . . . evidently by Martineau. When you get to the end of it you will see pretty clearly that it is animated by a spirit of retaliation for the attack I made upon him. It is clever, as might be expected; but it contains sundry cases of the usual Martineau Jesuitisms and dishonesties—ascribing to me things which I have not said, and misinterpreting things which I have said . . . .

The *Westminster Review* devotes three pages to the book. . . . But the tone of it is somewhat tepid—as I expected it would be.

The *British Quarterly* has given me an agreeable surprise. In its epilogue on books and affairs under the head of Science, there is a brief notice very cordially expressed, stating that they . . . propose to devote an article to it in their next number. It is rather odd that here, where I had expected most antagonism, there is most recognition. . . .

I am well and getting on with my work satisfactorily. I was strongly tempted to go to Cambridge [to the British Association], but concluded that the excitement would be too much for me.

13 *October*.—I think I told you that I had promised to go to Paris with Mr. Silsbee. . . . I shall have a quantity of work with me to revise, which will occupy me during my stay of three weeks or so; so that I shall not lose any time.

As usual, he very soon got weary of Paris and returned in a fortnight. As soon as he came back he took up Mr. Martineau's review of *First Principles*. In a letter to the *Athenæum* (November 8) he mentioned that the *National* reviewer has classed him "with a school whose religious conclusions I repudiate, alike on logical grounds

and as a matter of sentiment.'' In a second letter he adduced evidence to show that he had ample justification for characterizing the reviewer's statements as '' misrepresentations and grave ones.'' The '' agreeable surprise '' given by the *British Quarterly Review* in October was not long-lived. The next issue showed that his original expectation was not far wrong. For in the promised review his analysis of ultimate religious ideas is described as sounding '' like a great blazon of trumpets over a very small victory.'' The analysis of ultimate scientific ideas '' is occasionally tedious, but if the tediousness be overlooked, is very amusing, or might easily be made so.''

Spencer objected to press notices of his books being used for advertising purposes. But to satisfy Dr. Youmans, whom he wisely recognised as the best judge of what was expedient for the American public, he sent, early in 1863, a collection of such notices. '' As I told you, I do not propose to have them quoted in England; having a decided dislike to the practice. But I have no objection to their being used in the United States, if you think it will be desirable.'' There was indeed an urgent necessity for something being done there to sustain the interest that had been aroused in 1860. The unsettled political condition during 1861 had been '' deadly to generous support '' of such literature as did not bear upon the struggle in which the country was engaged.

To E. L. Youmans.

27 *February*, 1862.

When next you favour me with a letter I shall be very glad to hear from you what is the present state of

affairs and opinions respecting the secession. One sees here nothing more than extracts from American papers, and these are mostly from papers which probably do not truly represent the real feeling that prevails among you.

From E. L. Youmans.

4 *April*, 1862.

The fact is incontestable that the North is fighting for liberty, order, free industry, education, and the maintenance of stable government, while the South is contending for the opposite—slavery and its dark concomitants. Here the thing is well understood, but wherefore England should sympathise with the South, I confess, is not understood. How the views of large classes in England may be warped by their interests is plain; and how the newspapers may be influenced is also obvious; but how your dignified and philosophic Quarterlies can be brought to utter such unjust sentiments and flagrant misconceptions as their last issues contained, we are unable to explain. Do those Reviews fairly represent British feeling?

To E. L. Youmans.

15 *May*, 1862.

I am glad to see by the last account that the North is making great progress. I have held all along that whatever may be the solution to be finally desired, it is quite necessary that the North should show its power; and I rejoice to see it now doing this. I think Dr. Draper, in common with most other Americans, over-estimates what adverse feeling there is here. . . . Such adverse feeling as does exist is due to what we consider here to be the perverse misinterpretation of our motives—the suspicion that our commercial interests *must* bias us in favour of the South, and then the twisting of whatever we said and did into proof that we *were* biassed in favour of the South. As far as I had the means of judging, the

feeling here was at first *very decidedly* on the side of the North; and the change that has taken place has, as far as I have been able to observe, [been] wholly due to the cause I have assigned. But that feeling, however caused, has now very considerably abated.

14 *February,* 1863.—I am grieved to see the recent news respecting the state of the war. Though, as you know, I have all along held that it was both a necessary thing, and a desirable thing, that the separation should take place, yet I have always hoped to see the South restrained within narrow limits, and regard as disastrous, both for America and the world at large, anything which looks like a possibility of extension in their territory.

CHAPTER X

BIOLOGY

(*September*, 1862—*March*, 1867)

On his return from his holiday in September, 1862, he at once began the *Principles of Biology*, the first number of which was issued in January, 1863, and the second in April.

The announcement of Mr. Mill's *Utilitarianism* afforded him an opportunity of stating more clearly than he had done in *Social Statics*, his attitude towards the doctrine of Utility. The greater part of his letter of February 24, 1863, appears in the *Autobiography* (ii., 100). It concludes by expressing the hope that "the above explanations will make it clear that I am not really an antagonist to the doctrine of Utility. If not a Utilitarian in the direct sense, I am still a Utilitarian in the transcendental sense."

From J. S. Mill.

25 *February*, 1863.

I am obliged to you for your letter, and if the sheet is not struck off (which I fear it is) I will add to the note [pp. 91-2] in which you are mentioned, what is necessary to prevent the misapprehension you desire to guard against.

Note.—*Autobiography*, ii., chaps. xxxv., xxxvi., xxxvii., xxxviii., xxxix., xl.

Your explanation narrows the ground on which we differ, though it does not remove our difference; for, while I agree with you in discountenancing a purely empirical mode of judging of the tendencies of human actions, and would on that subject, as well as on all others, endeavour to reach the widest and most general principles attainable, I cannot admit that any of these principles are *necessary,* or that the practical conclusions which can be drawn from them are even (absolutely) universal.

As I am writing I cannot refrain from saying that your *First Principles* appear to me a striking exposition of a consistent and imposing system of thought; of which, though I dissent from much, I agree in more.

To J. S. Mill.

1 *March,* 1863.

I am greatly obliged to you for having not only made the desired alteration, but allowed me to see the proof. Taking advantage of your permission, I have ventured to make, in pencil, such changes of expression as are needed more completely to represent my view.

20 *March.*—I am much obliged to you for the copy of your reprinted essays on *Utilitarianism.* . . . Let me also thank you for having so readily acceded to my request respecting the explanation, as well as for having introduced the modifications of expression in it which I suggested.

To his Father.

9 *June,* 1863.

For myself I am well and busy—going out a good deal, and indeed rather too much. Saturday and Sunday I spent at the Lubbocks, along with Huxley and his wife, and Tyndall. On Wednesday I dine out again, on Friday again, and again on Sunday. . . . On the Fri-

day I am going specially to meet Lady Lubbock, who, Mrs. Lubbock says, is "dying to see me."[1]

Having issued the third number of the *Biology,* and taking with him the *Essays* he proposed to revise, he went about the middle of July to see his mother at Scarborough. While there he writes to his father: "I find my mother looking pretty well and in tolerably good spirits. . . . Your hand is *very much bolder,* whence I infer that you are considerably better. . . . For myself I am very well and comfortably placed, and like Scarborough much for its variety and picturesqueness." From Scarborough he went to the West of Scotland, in company with Mr. Lott and another friend, eventually reaching Ardtornish.

His interests in the United States were being well looked after by Dr. Youmans, who thus describes the two objects to be aimed at: "To circulate your writings as extensively as possible, and to do it in such a manner that you might share the pecuniary results. It has been comparatively easy to accomplish the first object unembarrassed by the second." Mr. Appleton being ready to *share* the risk of publishing a selection from the *Essays,* though not seeing his way to take the whole of it, Dr. Youmans set about securing the necessary support, which was more liberal than Spencer could accept, though he warmly appreciated the generosity that prompted it.[2] But he acquiesced in an arrangement according to which his American friends were to provide the publishers with the stereotype plates, on the understanding that no

[1] See *Autobiography,* ii., 82.
[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans,* p. 161. *Autobiography,* ii., 113.

royalty should be paid to him until his friends had been recouped their outlay. In the *Autobiography* he says: "This was, I believe, the course eventually adopted. Funds were raised to pay the cost of reprinting the several volumes named, and after those who furnished them had been recouped, I began to receive a royalty on all copies sold." Subsequent correspondence does not bear out his recollection of "the course eventually adopted."

FROM E. L. YOUMANS.

1 *January*, 1865.

As respects the copyright money sent you, or the certificates of its investment, I have only to say that it accrues to you from the sale of your books, and if you do not draw it, D. Appleton & Co. will have the benefit of it.

When your letter, refusing to accept anything from the avails of your books until all who had subscribed to their republication were repaid, was received, I circulated it among those principally interested. They appreciated your feelings in the matter, but said your scruples were groundless, as you totally misconceived the case—that they had aided to republish the works for public reasons, as they had a perfect right to do, and were ready, if desirable, to increase their contributions, but not to receive back what they had so gladly given. They have not regarded it at all in the light of a personal matter, nor can they be made to do so now. While they consider themselves richly compensated by the success of your works, and the unmistakable symptoms of their powerful influence upon public opinion, the fact that the author gets his just compensation is regarded as an agreeable incident of the enterprise.

And now allow me to remind you of a remark you made some time since to the effect that you had better

leave this business of reprints to us on this side and take no responsibility in the matter.

To E. L. Youmans.

23 *January*, 1865.

I am very much impressed by the manifestation of sympathy and generosity implied in your explanation respecting the proceeds of copyright. I should have preferred that the matter should have been transacted in the modified way that I originally requested, and I feel somewhat uncomfortable under the much heavier obligation entailed on me by the course pursued; but, at the same time, this extreme self-sacrifice displayed by my American friends is a source of very pleasurable feeling to me, not only in its personal aspects, but also as a testimony of their interest in the propagation of the views with which I am identified.

The success of the *Essays* had suggested the expediency of bringing out an American edition of *Social Statics*.

From E. L. Youmans.

12 *April*, 1864.

I think you once remarked to me that certain of your views had been considerably modified since the publication of *Social Statics*, but as you intimated that the change consisted in a divergence from the democratic views there expressed, the volume may be more acceptable to us in its present form than it would be after your revision.[1]

To E. L. Youmans.

18 *May*, 1864.

Respecting *Social Statics*, I gave you a somewhat wrong impression if you gathered from me that I had

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans*, p. 176.

receded from any of its main principles. The parts which I had in view, when I spoke of having modified my opinions on some points, were chiefly the chapters on the rights of women and children. I should probably also somewhat qualify the theological form of expression used in some of the earlier chapters. But the essentials of the book would remain as they are. When you come to the reprinting of *Social Statics,* should that project be persevered in, I should like to put a brief prefatory note, stating my present attitude towards it.[1]

Dr. Youmans hoped that Spencer would devote sufficient space to put readers in full possession of his later views. When the promised preface was sent in November, Spencer wrote: "I fear it will disappoint you in not containing any specific explanations. But I could not make these in any satisfactory way without occupying more space than would be desirable and more time than I can now afford. I think, too, it will be better policy at present to leave the disclaimer in the comparatively vague form in which I have put it."

FROM E. L. YOUMANS.

1 *January,* 1865.

I was not disappointed in it as a disclaimer, but was somewhat so that it was *only* a disclaimer. I had hoped there would be a little of something else to relieve it of its naked, negative character. . . . But the effect of this preface in its present form will undoubtedly be bad upon the work. . . . If I had followed my own preference I would have written a preface saying certain things which I could very well have said, and absorbing the entire contents of your preface into it as a private letter, stating your present attitude to the work. . . . I do not purpose to change a word nor to neutralise its

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans,* p. 180.

influence by counter-statements; but simply, by distributing it through another medium, to somewhat diminish the injurious effect which it will have by being placed and read alone.

To E. L. Youmans.

23 *January*, 1865.

Pray do as you think best respecting the preface to the American edition of *Social Statics*. Probably it will be better to embody the explanations I have made in an introduction of your own, as you propose. All I wish is, to make it understood that the book must be read with some qualifications; and this end will be as well achieved in your own [words] as in mine.

"After repeated attempts to comminute and macerate" the preface Dr. Youmans had to give it up, and let it appear as Spencer had put it.

The fourth instalment of the *Biology* had been delayed partly owing to his having devoted some three months to the revision of a second series of *Essays*. A more serious interruption was caused by his having turned aside to set himself right as to his relations to Comte and Positivism. In a letter to the *New Englander* towards the end of November, 1863, he repudiated being classed as a follower of Comte.

On all . . . points that are distinctive of his philosophy, I differ from him. I deny his hierarchy of the Sciences. I regard his division of intellectual progress into three phases, theological, metaphysical and positive, as superficial. I regret utterly his religion of humanity. And his ideal of society I hold in detestation. Some of his minor views I accept; some of his incidental remarks seem to me profound; but from everything which distinguishes Comtism as a system, I dissent entirely.

When he wrote to the *New Englander* he had no idea of going beyond the immediate purpose of correcting the misapprehension in the United States. But it now occurred to him that it might be well to set forth his views in full, and immediately on his return from Derby in January, 1864, he set about doing this. Once more he was led further than he at first intended. While preparing the pamphlet on "The Classification of the Sciences," there appeared M. Laugel's article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for February 15, 1864. "I find the impression that I belong to the school of Comte is so general," he tells his father, "and so likely to be confirmed by M. Laugel's article, that I am about to write a full denial on all points." Proofs of "Reasons for Dissenting from the Philosophy of M. Comte" were sent to Mr. G. H. Lewes.[1] Several scientific men were invited to say whether Comte had influenced them, or any men they knew. The gist of their replies was embodied in the pamphlet, but after it had been put in type this paragraph was omitted.

To E. L. Youmans.

26 *March*, 1864.

I enclose along with this a slip-proof of a portion which I suppressed from the pamphlet, from a desire not to seem needlessly hostile to the Comtists here. I do not suppose you will find any use for it. But if you do, do not make use of my name. Since having suppressed it from the pamphlet here, it is not desirable that I should assert it elsewhere.

The suppressed paragraph, besides summarising the denials of Tyndall, Huxley, Herschel, Babbage, Lyell

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 128; also Appendix B., p. 485. *George Eliot's Life*, ii., 381.

and Faraday that their course of thought had been influenced by Comte, points out how scientific conceptions and methods repudiated by Comte had, nevertheless, gained wider acceptance and greater definiteness. "Thus not only have M. Comte's teachings failed to change in any appreciable way the course of scientific thought in England; but its most marked advances have been in directions which he says it should not take."

With reference to this question, he wrote to Mr. Mill enquiring whether a letter dated 29 July, 1858,[1] was still in existence. "Unless I am very much mistaken respecting its contents, this letter would form tolerably conclusive evidence" as to the actual origin of the system of philosophy.

FROM J. S. MILL.

3 *April*, 1864.

I am, fortunately, able to send you the letter you want. No Englishman who has read both you and Comte, can suppose that you have derived much from him. No thinker's conclusions bear more completely the marks of being arrived at by the progressive development of his own original conceptions. . . . But the opinions in which you agree with Comte, and which, as you truly observe, are in no way peculiar to him, are exactly those which would make French writers class you with him; because, to them, Comte and his followers are the only thinkers who represent opposition to their muddy metaphysics.

I myself owe much more to Comte than you do, though in my case also, all my principal conclusions had been reached before I saw his book. But in speculative matters (not in practical) I often agree with him where you do not, and, among other subjects, in this particular one,

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 27.

the Classification of the Sciences. The fact you mention of your having read only a portion of his *Cours de Philosophie Positive,* explains some things to me which I did not understand previously; for, if you had read the entire book, I think you would have recognised that several of the things which you urge as objections to his theory, are parts of the theory.

I have lately had occasion to re-read, and am still reading, your *Principles of Psychology.* I do not agree any more than I did before with the doctrine of the introduction; but as to the book itself, I cannot help expressing to you how much my opinion of it, though already high, has been raised (I hope from a progress in my own mind) by this new reading. There is much of it that did not by any means strike me before as it does now; especially the parts which show how large a portion of our mental operations consist in the recognition of relations between relations. It is very satisfactory to see how you and Bain, each in his own way, have succeeded in affiliating the conscious operations of mind to the primary unconscious organic actions of the nerves, thus filling up the most serious lacuna and removing the chief difficulty in the association psychology.

To J. S. Mill.

8 *April,* 1864.

I am greatly obliged to you for your letter of the 3rd, enclosing the letter I referred to, which has been so fortunately preserved. Your expression of opinion on the question at issue was also extremely satisfactory to me: coming as it does from one so fully acquainted with the facts of the case, and so free from bias. It has served to confirm me in the belief that the position I have taken is a justifiable one.

Let me thank you also for the very gratifying expression of your opinion respecting the *Principles of Psychology.* I need scarcely say that, coming from you, this favourable criticism gives me a better assurance than

any which I have yet had, that the book has not been written in vain.

Respecting the doctrine of the introduction, I have hitherto postponed returning to the question until the time when a second edition afforded an opportunity to do so. But as you have referred to it, it seems proper now to say, that I believe the disagreement arises mainly from a difference of verbal interpretation. It did not occur to me when I used it as I have done, that the word "inconceivable" was liable to be understood as the equivalent of "incredible." By an *inconceivable* proposition, I, in all cases, meant an *unthinkable* proposition—a proposition of which the elements cannot be *united in consciousness*—cannot be thought of in *direct relation.*

Towards the end of his letter of 3rd April, Mr. Mill mentions with approval the work being done by Professor Bain and Spencer, each in his own way. The differences between these two on philosophical questions seemed but to bring out more clearly their regard for one another—a regard (already strong in those early days) which grew in strength as year succeeded year. The following is an acknowledgement of the second edition of *The Senses and the Intellect,* which Professor Bain had kept back as long as possible in order to be in possession of Spencer's latest utterances in the *Biology.*

To Alexander Bain.

March, 1864.

I see that you have made some references to my speculations and criticisms; and have done so in a very friendly spirit. I am the more gratified by this, because I feared that you might be somewhat annoyed by my review of your second volume. I am very glad to find that the differences of opinion which I freely expressed

in it, have not induced any disagreeable feeling. I am, indeed, impressed with the great generosity of nature which your reception of them implies.

His health and power of work were about this time better than usual. The excitement accompanying his criticism of Comte had, he thought, done him good. The social excitements of the London season were also borne for a time without injury. But by midsummer he had to admit that he had been going out too much. After bringing his mother home from Matlock, and spending a short time with the Lotts in Wales, he went to Scotland.

To his Father.

Ardtornish, 28 *August*, 1864.

I have now been here nine days; and the time has passed very pleasantly. I have been very cordially treated—more so than usual, I think. . . .

I have declined Bain's invitation. I did not dare to run the risk of discussions.

7 *October*.—The opening article in the *North American Review* for July is one on the Nebular Hypothesis—taking for text my second series of Essays. It disagrees on some points, but is very civil and complimentary.

About the middle of October, the concluding number of the first volume of the *Biology* was issued. "Fancy my disgust," he writes next month, "on reading in the list of the books of the week in the *London Review*, my own just published volume announced as *Electro-Biology*, vol. i. . . . I am getting on with my writing satisfactorily, and am working out the Morphology of Plants with unexpected success." The issue of the first

number of vol. ii. was delayed " in consequence of the number of woodcuts I am having prepared in illustration of vegetal morphology. The choice and arrangement and execution of these gives a great deal of trouble, and keeps me tied here. I shall not, in consequence, be able to get down to Derby till after Christmas." As if his biological work were not enough to have on hand at one time, he took an active part along with a few friends in an attempt to reorganise the *Reader*. He himself contributed four articles: " What is Electricity? " " The Constitution of the Sun," " The Collective Wisdom," and " Political Fetichism." Endeavours were made to obtain the co-operation of men of standing.

To Charles Darwin.

22 *April*, 1865.

We are getting our staff of the *Reader* into better working order; and are proposing forthwith to use all the means available for making a more decided impression, and establishing our position. Profs. Huxley and Tyndall, Mr. J. S. Mill and myself, have severally agreed to write a few leading articles by way of giving the intended tone and direction.

Among other means of making the public aware of the character of the *Reader*, we propose to obtain, so far as possible, occasional brief letters from the leading men of science, announcing such interesting novelties as admit of being understood by the general public, and are of fit nature to be quoted from our columns. I have a letter from Sir John Herschel consenting to aid us in this way. Sir Charles Lyell, too, has promised the like aid. Can you in like manner give us, occasionally, the valuable help of your name? . . .

A letter of a *dozen lines* would suffice the purpose of giving us the weight of your name, and making it appar-

ent that you joined in the effort to establish a scientific journal, and an organ of progressive opinion.

To J. S. Mill.

26 *May,* 1865.

I hope you are better satisfied with the *Reader.* It is rapidly improving in circulation; but I fear we shall now have to pass through a trying period, during which the want of advertisements will be very much felt.

It appears that the putting of initials to articles is not of very much service—many of the public having been quite in the dark as to who "J. S. M." was. It is suggested that the full names should be put. What is your feeling on this point?

The article some weeks since on the *Edinburgh Review* caused a breach with the Longmans, as was to be expected. They had not advertised for some time previously, and of course have not done so since.

From J. S. Mill.

Avignon, 29 *May,* 1865.

With regard to the *Reader,* I like the plan of full signatures. . . . But, to admit of this it would be necessary for the *Reader* to give up the plan it has recently adopted of making slashing attacks to right and left, with very insufficient production of evidence to justify the vituperation; and in a manner which gives to an indifferent spectator the impression either of personal ill-will in the particular case, or of general flippancy and dogmatism. Contributors will not like to identify themselves by name with a publication which would embroil them with an unlimited number of angry and vindictive writers, together with their friends and their publishers. I myself should not like to be supposed to be in any way connected, for instance, with the attack on the *Edinburgh Review* (for which I am at this very time preparing an article)—an attack of which I totally dislike the

tone, and agree only partially with the substance: and it happens that the article singled out from the last number for special contempt, my name, too, being cited against it, is by a personal friend of my own, a man of very considerable merit, whom I was desirous of securing as a recruit for the *Reader*, and who is very naturally hurt and indignant at the treatment of him. I am by no means against severity in criticism, but the more it is severe, the more it needs to be well weighed and justly distributed.

It was now some years since Spencer had written an article of any magnitude or importance for the larger Reviews. The reason for breaking his rule in 1865 is given in the following correspondence, which, apart from its bearing on the questions discussed, has value as a revelation of the generous catholicity of the writers.

From J. S. Mill.

Blackheath, 11 *March*, 1865.

Dr. Chapman will send you in the course of a day or two a copy of an article of mine on Comte, which is to be published in the forthcoming *Westminster*. In forming an estimate of him, I have necessarily come into collision with some of your opinions—a thing for which I should never think of apologising to you or any advanced thinker; but it has so happened that though our points of agreement very greatly exceed in number and importance those of difference, the latter are those respecting which, accidentally, most has been said to the public, on my side at least. What I have now written, however, will give a very false impression of my feelings, if it raises any idea but that of minor differences of opinion between allies and fellow-combatants. In a larger volume which I shall soon have the pleasure of offering to you, there will be little or nothing to qualify the expres-

sion of the very high value I attach to your philosophic labours.

To J. S. Mill.

13 *March*, 1865.

I am greatly obliged to you for your note of the 11th; and appreciate the kind feeling which dictated it.

I thoroughly sympathise with your view respecting the candid expression of differences of opinion. My own practice has always been that of pointing out what appears to me erroneous, quite irrespective of any personal considerations; and I am quite prepared to have the opinions I express treated by other thinkers with a like individual regard for the interests of truth. Moreover, I am fully convinced that what you may think it needful to say, in opposition to anything that I have said, must always be something which it is well to have said: either as an indication of a mistake, or else as the indication of some imperfection in the argument or some fault of exposition which needs rectifying.

On receipt of the promised copy of Mr. Mill's *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* Spencer deemed it necessary to deal with the question at issue between them, namely, the ultimate test of truth. This was done in the *Fortnightly Review* for July.

From J. S. Mill.

12 *August*, 1865.

When I received your article in the *Fortnightly Review*, the reprint of my book on Hamilton was too far advanced to admit of my correcting at the proper place the misconception which you pointed out in p. 536 of the *Review*. I consequently added a note at the end of the volume, of which, in case you have not seen it, I enclose a transcript.[1]

[1] *Essays*, ii., 195. Mill's *Examination*, p. 175, note †, third edition.

I do not find that the distinction between the two senses of the word inconceivable, removes or diminishes the difference between us. I was already aware that the inconceivability which you regard as an ultimate test, is the impossibility of uniting two ideas in the same mental representation. But unless I have still further misunderstood you, you regard this incapacity of the conceptive faculty merely as the strongest proof that can be given of a necessity of belief. Your test of an ultimate truth I still apprehend to be, the invariability of the belief of it, tested by an attempt to believe its negative.

I have, in my turn, to correct a partial misunderstanding of my own meaning. I did not assert that a belief is proved not to be necessary by the fact that some persons deny its necessity, but by the fact that some persons do not hold the belief itself; which opinion seems as evident as the other would be absurd.

On the main question between us, your chief point seems to be that the Idealist argument is reduced to nonsense if we accept the Idealist conclusions, since it cannot be expressed without assuming an objective reality producing, and an objective reality receiving, the impression. The experience to which our states of mind are referred to is, *ex vi termini* (you think), experience of something other than states of mind. This would be true if *all* states of mind were referred to something anterior: but the ultimate elements in the analysis I hold to be themselves states of mind, viz., sensations, memories of sensation, and expectations of sensation. I do not pretend to account for these, or to recognise anything in them beyond themselves and the order of their occurrence; but I do profess to analyse our other states of consciousness into them. Now I maintain that these are the only substratum I need postulate; and that when anything else seems to be postulated, it is only because of the erroneous theory on which all our language is constructed, and that, if the concrete words used are interpreted as meaning our expectations of sensations, the

nonsense and unmeaningness which you speak of do not arise.

I quite agree with you, however, that our difference is "superficial rather than substantial," or at all events need not and does not affect our general mode of explaining mental phenomena. From the first I have wished to keep the peace with those whose belief in a substratum is simply the belief in an Unknowable. You have said what you deemed necessary to set yourself right on the points which had been in controversy between us. I am glad you have done so, and am now disposed to let the matter rest. There will probably be other and more hostile criticisms, by Mansel or others, and if I should think it desirable to reply to them, I could on the same occasion make some remarks on yours, without the appearance of antagonism which I am anxious to avoid.

To J. S. Mill.

Ardtornish, 21 *August*, 1865.

I am much obliged by your courtesy in sending me a copy of the note to the new edition of your work on Hamilton. . . . Thank you very much for the very candid explanation which the note contains. It sets the matter quite straight.

The partial misstatement of your own view which you point out I will endeavour to set right should there occur (or rather as soon as there occurs) an opportunity for doing so.

I am much gratified to find that the discussion has been thus far carried on, and, indeed, for the present concluded, without having produced anything beyond intellectual difference.

London, 11 *October*.—Many thanks for the copy of the sixth edition of your *Logic*, which you have been so kind as to send me. I shall have to study it afresh before preparing the second edition of my *Psychology*, should

I ever get so far; and I am very glad to have, thus brought up to date, the latest developments of your views on the many important questions dealt with.

I have of course already read the chapter in which you discuss the chief questions at issue between us; and am obliged to you for the care you have so promptly taken to restate my position as recently explained afresh. Without entering upon any of the chief points of the argument as it now stands, I will just refer to the fact that on one of the issues the question is greatly narrowed —coming, as it does, to a direct opposition between the verdicts of your consciousness and my own. You remark—" When Mr. Spencer says that while looking at the sun, a man cannot conceive that he is looking into darkness, he means, a man cannot *believe* that he is doing so. For he is aware that it is possible, in broad daylight, to *imagine* oneself looking into darkness." To these interpretations of my meaning I demur; I do really, in this case as in other cases, mean the words " cannot conceive " to be used in their rigorous sense. The verdict of consciousness, as it seems to me (and I find it the same with three competent friends to whom I have put the question), is that when looking at the sun I not only cannot *imagine* that I am *then* and *there* looking into darkness (and this is the point at issue), but I cannot even imagine darkness at all. The attempt to imagine myself looking into darkness, I find can be carried to the extent of imagining some other scene in which I have before experienced darkness; but while I can imagine the various elements of the scene which accompany the darkness, I cannot imagine the darkness itself. I can bring into consciousness all those impressions along with which I have experienced the darkness of a cellar, but I cannot bring with them the impression of darkness itself, *while my consciousness is occupied with the vivid impression of light.* Even did I find that I can, under such conditions, imagine darkness in the abstract, this would not be equivalent to finding that I can, under such

conditions, think, or conceive, or imagine, that I am actually *at the moment,* looking into darkness; and this, I take it, is the real point.

From J. S. Mill.

Avignon, 29 *October,* 1865.

I have kept your letter by me unanswered, partly for want of time, and partly in hopes that the delay might enable something to occur to me which would throw light on the rather subtle matter of difference between us which you bring to my notice. It is evident that I have again a misapprehension of your opinion to confess and correct, since you do not acknowledge it as yours in the mode in which it is stated by me. We seem to differ on two questions, one a question of fact, viz., whether it is possible, while looking at the sun, to imagine darkness. You, and your three friends, think it is not, while my consciousness seems to tell me that it is quite as possible to imagine darkness in its absence, as anything else in its absence. Of course, the stronger present impression of an actual sensation makes the simultaneous consciousness of a mere recollection seem feeble by comparison. But it appears to me perfectly real, and as like the impression of sense which it corresponds to as most reminiscences are to their originals. But, you say, even if I could, under such conditions, imagine darkness, it would not follow that I could imagine that I am actually at the moment looking into darkness. To me it seems that to imagine an object of light is always to imagine myself actually at the moment seeing it. I think one never imagines anything otherwise than as an immediate and present impression of one's own. Indeed, when the object to be conceived is darkness, there is absolutely nothing else to imagine than oneself trying to see and not seeing; for darkness is not a positive thing. It seems to me, then, that I can, in broad daylight, *conceive myself* then and there looking into darkness. Is this the

The last page of one of my proofs which has been criticised by Huxley, and on which he sketched in by the side what he conceived to be the shape of a leaf.

differentiated in proportion as their relations to incident forces become different. And here, as before, we see that in each unit, considered by itself, the differences of dimension are greatest in those directions in which the parts are most differently conditioned; while there are no differences between the dimensions of parts that are not differently conditioned.*

* It was by an observation on the forms of leaves, that I was first led to the views set forth in the preceding and succeeding chapters on the morphological differentiation of plants and animals. In the year 1851, during a country ramble in which the structures of plants had been a topic of conversation, with a friend—Mr G. H. Lewes—I happened to pick up the leaf of a buttercup, and drawing it by its foot-stalk through my fingers so as to thrust together its deeply-cleft divisions, observed that its palmate and almost radial form was changed into a bilateral one; and that were the divisions to grow together in this new position, an ordinary bilateral leaf would result. Joining this observation with the familiar fact that leaves, in common with the larger members of plants habitually turn themselves to the light, it occurred to me that a natural change in the circumstances of the leaf might readily cause such a modification of form as that which I had produced artificially. If, as they often do with plants, soil and climate were greatly to change the habit of the buttercup, making it branched and shrub-like; and if these palmate leaves were thus much overshadowed by each other; would not the inner segments of the leaves grow towards the periphery of the plant where the light was greatest, and so change the palmate form into a more decidedly bilateral form? Immediately I began to look round for evidence of the relation between the forms of leaves and general characters of the plants they belonged to; and soon found some signs of connexion. Certain anomalies, or seeming anomalies, however, prevented me from then pursuing the inquiry much further. But consideration cleared up these difficulties; and the idea afterwards widened into the general doctrine here elaborated. Occupation with other things prevented me from giving expression to this general doctrine until Jan. 1859; when I published an outline of it in the *Medici-Chirurgical Review*.

FAC-SIMILE OF A PROOF FROM THE *PRINCIPLES OF BIOLOGY*,
With a pictorial comment by Huxley on the difficulties of Spencer.

same thing, or not the same thing, as what you mean by the words " conceive *that I am* then and there looking into darkness? " It strikes me that this change of the expression to the form *I am,* just marks the transition from conception to belief—from an imagination of something thought as absent from the senses, to an apprehension of something which is thought to be present to the senses; of which two states of mind I hold the former to be, in the assumed circumstances, possible, the latter impossible. It was in this way I was led to think that you were here using the word conception in the sense of belief. Even now, I cannot see how the phrase, to conceive that I am, or that anything is, can be consistent with using the word conceive in its rigorous sense.

These letters bring out (as clearly perhaps as the subject permits) " the rather subtle matter of difference " between Mr. Mill and Spencer concerning the ultimate test of truth.

The microscopic investigations undertaken while dealing with morphology and physiology had opened up an interesting enquiry regarding circulation in plants and the formation of wood, his earlier preparations being shown to Dr. Hooker, Professor Huxley, and Dr. Busk in January, 1865. " Most naturalists will regard it as an audacious speculation," he tells Dr. Youmans, " but as Hooker and Huxley are inclined to endorse my reasonings, I feel at ease on the matter."

The usual respite was taken after the issue of his serial in June, 1865. During his stay at Ardtornish this year he mentions having caught a salmon of 9½ lbs.—the largest he had ever yet got. He expected " to be in first-rate condition " by the time he left.

To his Father.

London, 3 *October*, 1865.

I am getting on satisfactorily with my work and expect to send you some proofs in less than a fortnight. The theory of the vertebrate skeleton works out far more completely than I had expected.

11 *December*.—Meanwhile I am busy with No. 16; . . . By the 20th I hope to get ready as much MS. as will give me something to do in revising while I am down at Derby. If nothing intervenes I propose to come down to you about the 21st, and stay with you till the end of the month; after which, if you feel equal to it, you had better come and spend a week with me in town. I am glad to gather that my mother has borne up so well during your late attack. I hope she continues to do so. Give my love to her and say I shall see her shortly.

During the few days at home he carried on his microscopic study of the circulating system of plants, returning to town in time for the usual New Year's dinner at the Huxleys', to which he refers when writing to his father.

To his Father.

3 *January*, 1866.

Our evening was a very pleasant one. Among other guests was Mr. Ellis, an ardent educationist, who has done great service in popularising Political Economy for schools. . . .

I am busy while I dictate in re-examining my preparations, which, while I was at Derby, I had only so far examined as to see that they were worth preserving. I find they now furnish me with far more beautiful cases than I had before perceived. While I was travelling up I hit upon the idea needful for the complete interpreta-

tion of plant circulation. I have the whole thing now as satisfactorily demonstrable as can well be imagined.

15 *January.*—Since I wrote last I have been showing my preparations to Hooker, Busk and Huxley. The results turn out to be new. These structures in certain classes of leaves were unknown to them all; and they could find no descriptions of them, and they recognise their significance. It turns out, too, that though there have been experiments on the absorption of dyes, they have been limited to the cases of stems, in which the results are, when taken by themselves, confusing and indeed misleading. They were all of them taken aback by the results I have shown them; which are so completely at variance with the doctrines that have been of late years current; and they have nothing to say against the hypothesis based on these facts which I have propounded to them. It is proposed that I should put the facts and arguments in the shape of a paper for the Linnæan Society; and it is probable that I shall do so, eventually including it in the appendix to the *Biology.*

24 *January.*—I am half through, or more, with my paper for the "Linnæan." The argument works out very satisfactorily.

30 *January.*—I am using as a dye, infusion of logwood, which I find answers in some respects much better than magenta. I shall be able, I think, very completely to demonstrate my proposition. I am getting much more skilled in making preparations, and have hit on a way of doing them with readiness and efficiency. On Sunday I discovered some spiral and annular structures of marvellous size—four or five times the diameter of any that I have previously found, or seen figured. They exist in the aberrant leaf of an aberrant plant, which I daresay has never been before examined.

26 *February.*—I should have written before, but I have been so very busy preparing specimens, making drawings, and revising my paper for the Linnæan Society. It is announced for Thursday next.

The paper was read on 1st March. Further examinations and experiments in revising it for inclusion in the Transactions of the Society occupied him during the month. After a visit to his parents at Easter he set to work on the fourth number of vol. ii. of the *Biology,* which was issued in June. Of this number Mr. Darwin wrote to Dr. Hooker:—

"It is wonderfully clever and I daresay mostly true. . . . If he had trained himself to observe more, even at the expense, by the law of balancement, of some loss of thinking power, he would have been a wonderful man."[1] On his return to London in September, he took up his abode at 37, Queen's Gardens, Bayswater, which was to be his home for many years. Here he set to work, amid many interruptions, to complete the volume, three numbers of which still remained to be brought out. Towards the close of February, 1867, he was able to tell Dr. Youmans: "I am in the middle of the last chapter but one of the *Biology;* and make sure of getting the volume out before the end of March, if no unforeseen hindrance occurs. It will be a cause of great rejoicing with me to have got through so trying a part of my undertaking."

[1] *Life and Letters of C. Darwin,* ii., 239.

CHAPTER XI

SUNSHINE AND SHADOW

(*December*, 1865—*July*, 1867)

The number of the *Biology* issued in December, 1865, contained a notice to the effect that on completion of the volume the series would cease. The circumstances that led to this decision, and the efforts made to prevent its being carried out, are narrated in the *Autobiography* (ii., 154, 575). One of the first to interest himself was Mr. J. S. Mill.

To his Father.

15 *February*, 1866.

I enclose you a very gratifying letter which I received from John Mill some ten days ago. It shows great generosity. I have, however, declined both the offers it makes. As you will see, he clearly does not understand the nature of the loss which led me to issue the notice—he thinks that it is nothing more than the difference between the receipts from the subscribers and the cost of printing; and that were the bare expenses of publication met I should have no difficulty in going on. I have explained to him how the matter stands.

Williams and Norgate hinted to me the other day that there was a movement in progress to do something that would meet the case in a way that I could agree to. I learn also that John Mill has called upon them since he got my reply to his letter.

Note.—*Autobiography*, ii., chaps. xxxviii., xxxix., xl.

To E. L. Youmans.

2 *March*, 1866.

Count Limburg Stirum . . . one of Comte's executors, has written to Lewes, sending through him to me a draft for £10 towards a publication fund, and proposing to form a committee for the furtherance of the matter, and wishes that the *Fortnightly Review* should make itself the organ for carrying out such a plan. Of course, in pursuance of the attitude I have taken up, I returned him the draft, explaining how matters stood.

A proposal that came from some of his friends that those interested "should subscribe for a sufficient number of copies to secure the author from loss," was not so easily disposed of.

To T. H. Huxley.

11 *April*, 1866.

My reflections over the matter of our talk the other night have ended in a qualified agreement to the arrangements—an agreement under conditions.

In the first place, as to the number of copies to be taken. This is too great. I do not know how 250 was fixed upon. . . . Thus, then, I conclude that an extra circulation here of 150 will suffice, joined with what I may otherwise fairly count upon. And to this number, I should wish that the additional copies taken may be limited.

In the second place, as you say that the wishes to further the continuance of the work have, in the main, acted spontaneously, I will yield to your argument that the acts are in a sense public ones, with which I am not personally concerned—but with one reservation. I can take this view of the matter only in those cases where the sacrifices involved are not likely to be seriously felt. Those to whom guineas come in some abundance may be

H. S. when 40

allowed to spend them in this way; but those who have to work hard for them, and have already heavy burdens to bear, cannot be allowed to do so. Having granted your premises, my exception to your conclusion may be quite illogical; but I must, nevertheless, make it. No re-assertion of the position that the act is public and the motive impersonal would suffice to get rid of what would be to me an intolerable consciousness, were any save those who are quite at their ease to join in these transactions.

Subsequently he withdrew this conditional acquiescence for the reason given in a letter to Professor Huxley, written from Derby in May, about three weeks after the death of his father.[1]

Not less eager were his friends in the United States to avert, if possible, the threatened calamity. On learning the facts towards the end of 1865, Dr. Youmans had remarked: "You will not object to my using them here in any way that seems desirable." Had Spencer known what his friends thought of doing, he would certainly have taken measures to prevent it. No one knew this better than Dr. Youmans. "Of course it won't do to let Spencer know what is going on at all. He would spoil it, sure as fate." By the middle of June, 7,000 dollars had been collected. "So the Spencer affair is finished, all but the most troublesome part," he told his sister; anticipating difficulty in persuading Spencer to accept the gift. It had not all been smooth sailing. Besides having to rouse the enthusiasm of disciples, he had to counteract the effects of adverse criticism, which "embargoes 'Liberal Christianity' and leaves us to raise money out of 'the world, the flesh, and the devil.'"

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 575.

A criticism in the *Christian Examiner* (March, 1866) was described as "the ablest thing yet against Spencer," and for a time he feared the effect it might have on his appeal.

As the bearer of the letter from Mr. R. B. Minturn, announcing the handsome testimonial, Dr. Youmans came to London. Writing to his sister, he describes the astonishment and pleasure with which Spencer read Mr. Minturn's letter.[1] Other letters of sympathy and encouragement accompanied this token of America's good will.

From William R. Alger.

18 *June*, 1866.

We do this in a pure spirit of loyalty to truth and humanity, without the slightest egotistical thought of ourselves or of you. We do it as a simple act of justice. We shall be deeply disappointed if you do not rise above every disagreeable personal feeling, and accept this offering in the spirit in which it is made, in the service of science and society.

From Henry Ward Beecher.

June, 1866.

The peculiar condition of American society has made your writings far more fruitful and quickening here than in Europe. We are conscious of great obligations to you, and perplexed because we cannot acknowledge them as we could were we your fellow citizens.

But we cannot consent to lie under such obligations without some testimonial of our feelings respecting your eminent service to us, and to the cause of the emancipa-

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 165. *Edward Livingston Youmans*, p. 213.

tion and enlightenment of the human mind, so dear to us all.

And we are sure that you will not allow any scruples of personal delicacy to make you unjust to us, or to compel us to forbear the only action which is possible to us at this distance, and in our circumstances.

In the last, or one of the last, of his letters to his father (March 27) he enclosed a letter from St. Petersburg, "which will give you an agreeable surprise, as it did me." The agreeable surprise was a request for permission to translate his books into Russian. "The Classification of the Sciences" was the first to appear. To meet his objection to this being selected to start with, he was informed that books discussing religion or politics would not be tolerated by the authorities. The "Classification" passed successfully; but a translation of the *Essays* was seized, owing to the essay on "Manners and Fashion," which was supposed to call in question the validity and eternity of the monarchical principle and of divine right! For attempting to publish it the translator had rendered himself liable to prosecution for a criminal offence, the penalty for which varied from six years penal servitude to eight months imprisonment in a fortress. The translator requested Spencer to be in readiness to insert a paragraph in the *Times*, in the event of an adverse verdict. It was not till March of the following year that Spencer learnt that the charge had been withdrawn—"s'est terminé parfaitement à la russe."

A French translation of *First Principles* was being made by Dr. E. Cazelles, who was strongly recommended by Mr. J. S. Mill. Writing to his father in October, 1865, Spencer had enclosed a letter from M. Renan in-

forming him that the book was likely to be translated. On hearing from Dr. Cazelles, towards the end of the following year, that half of it had already been translated, Spencer urged him to wait for the second edition before proceeding further.

Of his other doings during the second half of 1866 little is known. When narrating the occurrences of this time, he admitted that his memory was not very clear. He missed the letters to and from his father, which hitherto had served as milestones and sign-posts by which to follow the course of events. That his memory should have failed him is not surprising. The shock of his father's death, anxiety about his mother, depression consequent on the contemplated discontinuance of the System of Philosophy, and the unexpected manner in which that trouble had been removed, all these tended to prevent the course of things leaving a permanent impression. Before going to the meeting of the British Association, at Nottingham, Dr. Youmans and he spent a few days at Aberdovey, in Merionethshire. While there the article in the *Christian Examiner* by Mr. F. E. Abbot was discussed with a view to a reply Dr. Youmans intended to publish on his return to New York. "We are taking it up point by point," Dr. Youmans tells his sister. "Spencer talks, and I am amanuensis. . . . I have myself learned some matters and things worth knowing. Spencer doesn't recede or budge a hair, but he interprets."[1]

At Aberdovey, and afterwards in London, there were frequent talks about a lecture which Dr. Youmans was to deliver at the College of Preceptors on the "Scien-

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans*, p. 220.

tific Study of Human Nature." How he took the manuscript to Spencer, and what Spencer thought of it, are related by Dr. Youmans (28 September):

I arranged to call to-day at eleven to read my production to him. With my tail feathers spread and in a state of infinite complacency I went, and returned trailing my glories in the infernal London mud. Poor man! What could he do? There was but one thing to do, and he did it, you had better believe. Faithful indeed are the cruelties of a friend. My lecture was fairly slaughtered. I had such nice authorities for everything. What are " authorities " to Herbert Spencer. The pigs went to the wrong market this time. " A little too much effort at fine writing "—forty-five pages. " You have lost your point at the fifth page and not recovered it. Why, I thought you wished to make a sharp presentation of science in its bearings upon the study of human nature, and you seem to have entered upon a systematic treatise on physiology interlarded with bad psychology." The unfeeling wretch! " Strike out half, put the rest in type and work it up," was the final injunction.[1]

In March, 1867, Spencer took up what he calls the " agreeable task " of reorganising *First Principles*. As the earlier portions could be done out of London it occurred to him to take a short holiday in Paris.

To E. L. Youmans.

3 *May*, 1867.

I start for Paris on Sunday (very glad so to utilise that day); and expect to remain away ten days or so—taking a little work with me to revise, but devoting myself mainly to sight-seeing.

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans*, pp. 223 and 451.

7 *June*.—I went for a fortnight, and came back before the week was out. Perpetual sight-seeing soon became a weariness; and I was heartily glad to get back.

19 *June*.—The second edition of *First Principles* is working out very satisfactorily—even more satisfactorily than I had anticipated. In its reorganised form it will be extremely coherent all through—the thread of the argument will be unbroken; and it will, I think, have the obvious character of completeness.

The present seemed a favourable opportunity for introducing a distinctive general title for the series. In his letter to Dr. Youmans of 7 June, he mentioned that the evils arising from the want of such a title had just been thrust upon him afresh by the new edition of Lewes's *History of Philosophy*. "The Positive Philosophy will continue to be understood as the philosophy of Comte, and as I so distinctly repudiate the philosophy of Comte, it is needful to take some step to prevent the confusion. So long as there is no other title in use to express a philosophy formed of organised scientific knowledge, one cannot expect people to discriminate." Fearing that, in giving his reasons for adopting the new title, he would make it the occasion for emphasising afresh his antagonism to Comte, Dr. Youmans advised him to avoid the Comte discussion in the preface of the revised edition. Before the book was published in the autumn he had given up, though with reluctance, the idea of using the new title. "I discussed the matter with Huxley and Tyndall, and though I do not think that the objections raised were such as to outweigh the manifest advantages, still there doubtless are objections; and in the midst of conflicting considerations I eventu-

ally became so far undecided as to let the matter stand as it was."

In the midst of the anxieties arising from the prospect of having to relinquish his work, there came in April, 1866, the shock of his father's sudden illness and death. What this signified to him can be understood only by one who has, like the present writer, read the correspondence between father and son, carried on for three and thirty years. It must have seemed to Spencer a cruel fate that the premature abandonment of the System of Philosophy should so nearly coincide with the loss of one who had watched over its inception and been consulted in every detail. Although not indebted to his father for the leading doctrines of evolution, he was largely his debtor for the intellectual discipline which had made it possible to plan and so far elaborate his scheme, as well as for literary and expository criticism step by step as each chapter passed through the press. In the soundness of his father's critical judgment, he retained to the last the greatest confidence.

Hardly had he recovered from the shock of his father's death when he had to face the loss of his patient and gentle mother, who died in May, 1867. This event, although it did not come upon him, like the death of his father, with little warning, and although it did not mean the ending of an intellectual companionship which had been for so many years a precious possession, appealed nevertheless in a special manner to the emotional side of his nature. He knew that his mother had little sympathy with his intellectual pursuits, but he also knew that his welfare and happiness ever held a chief place in her thoughts, and that no sacrifice on her part would

have been grudged, if by it she could have promoted his interests. The death of his father deprived him of one with whom he had walked in the closest communion of thought since boyhood; by the death of his mother he was bereft of one in whom he saw embodied in no small measure those feminine affections for which, as he repeatedly tells us, his nature craved.

For years the health of his parents had been a source of increasing anxiety. As for his mother, he had long given up the hope of arresting, even if only for a time, the downward progress towards confirmed invalidism. Unlike his father, whose chronic nervousness tended to aggravate his disorders, his mother paid too little attention to premonitory symptoms, and neglected ordinary precautions. With his father, his endeavour generally was to convince him that he was not so ill as he thought he was; with his mother his aim was to get her to realise that she was worse than she thought she was. The ups and downs of his father's health had their sources in the condition of the nervous system which led to acts of imprudence when he was well, and to undue depression when he was ill. His mother's permanent ill-health was due to overdrafts on a system of low vitality. Her conservative obstinacy was proof against advice and remonstrance. The difficulty with his father was not occasioned by obstinate adherence to an adopted course of living, but to ever-changing views regarding his numerous ailments, and endless experimentation in the matter of diet, clothing, and therapeutics. Concern for his father, keen while it lasted, had months of respite, during which he felt at ease, provided that no unforeseen imprudence was committed. But as regards his mother

his anxiety had never been relieved by periods of hopefulness or satisfaction.

These remarks have been suggested by reperusal of his letters home during the last eight or ten years of his parents' lives: letters full of advice, expostulation, and entreaty. Here are a few characteristic extracts—mostly to his father.

It would almost seem as though you acted upon the maxim—" Of two evils choose the greater."

I think you are wrong in taking such liberties with yourself as you describe. . . . I wish you would be less particular about small risks and more particular about great ones.

All the reasons you name for *not coming* are so many reasons for *coming*. You are evidently nervous, and as usually happens with you in such condition, make mountains out of mole-hills. The various things which you say you want to settle, leave unsettled; and settle them on your return. In your present state, you are not a fit judge of what is best for you. Therefore, do just what I tell you. Pack up your carpet-bag and write me word by return of post at what hour on Sunday or Monday I shall meet you at King's Cross or Euston Station.

It is useful in this life to tolerate annoyances, and to think as little about them as possible. Everyone has lots of things to worry him. . . . In respect to present arrangements of the household, we must be content if matters can be made to go with some approach to regularity and smoothness. It is out of the question under such circumstances to avoid small evils.

You did not tell me when I asked you some time since how you were going on in respect of money. Pray do not borrow from anyone, but let me know if you fall short.

I think you had better give up your lessons. It will be very bad policy to make yourself ill over them. You must do as much teaching as will amuse you, but no more.

If (this to his mother) I thought it would be any good I would say a good deal in the way of exhortation that you should take care of yourself. But you are so incorrigible in the matter, that I expect you will do much the same whether I expostulate or not. I fear that nothing I can say will have any effect. I can only hope that you will behave better in this respect when I am absent than you do when I am present.

I hope (he writes to his father) you will *insist* on her not exerting herself by making the needless journeyings into the town which she does. They ought not to be allowed, whatever may be the reasons she assigns; for she will make any reason a sufficient one.

I am sorry to hear that my mother is becoming still feebler, and still persists in over-exerting herself. There is no remedy but *positive prevention*—using as much peremptoriness as may be needful.

You must do what you can to prevent her from fidgeting herself, and make her feel that it is *better to let things go a little wrong, rather than make herself worse by trying to keep them right.*

Your accounts of my mother are depressing; but I fear it is needful to reconcile ourselves to them, and to the expectation of such symptoms becoming more decided. You are doubtless right in thinking it may be needful to have more assistance. Pray do so whenever it seems requisite; do not let expense be a consideration.

It is sad to hear the accounts of my mother, though what you tell me is not more than what was to be expected. We may, however, be glad she is free from pain and is usually in pretty good spirits. This is as much

mitigation as can well be looked for. . . . Give my love to my mother, and you may add that she will probably see me shortly.

The following appears to be the last letter received from home.

FROM HIS FATHER.

9 *April*, 1866.

With regard to myself I am mending but slowly, if any. I seem to tire sooner, but so long as it does not get like the other attack, I shall do. I liked your proofs very much and hope my memoranda may not annoy you. When shall I be favoured with the next? . . . Your mother wonders from day to day that you don't come to see her. [He had just been to see her, but her memory was gone.] My back aches, so excuse more.

It has been the fashion to speak of Spencer's character as if it were all intellect and no feeling. The falsity of such an opinion was, however, well known to his friends. No one who knew him at all doubted his absolute sincerity when giving expression to his feelings; but even those who knew him intimately were apt to underestimate their intensity. Of the purity and depth of his affection for his parents, his letters, written during a period of more than thirty years, furnish a testimony that is conclusive. Some might think these letters lacking in gushing terms of endearment. But it is unsafe to draw conclusions as to the strength or the weakness of the emotions from the language employed to express them, unless account be taken of the character of the writer. In Spencer's case it would be a mistake to conclude that his feelings were of a low degree of intensity because he gave expression

to them in subdued terms. Some people unintentionally use the strongest terms in the language to express the most ordinary degrees of emotion. Others deliberately try to conceal the shallowness of their feelings in a turbulent torrent of superlative words. Spencer's dislike to exaggeration led him, of two or more ways of expressing his feelings, to choose the least highly coloured. Add to this his singular sincerity, which would not brook the use of language to conceal or miscolour his sentiments. And after all, mere emotional display of interest in the welfare of others is a form of sympathy which costs the giver as little as it benefits the receiver. In reading the letters to his parents, in which he enters into the minutest details regarding bodily ailments, or family misunderstandings, or business misfortunes, or mental distress, one cannot help thinking how much easier it would have been to have contented himself with offering the usual sympathetic platitudes. Time and trouble spent in trying to put right what he considered wrong were never grudged; no detail was too wearisome. If the emotional manifestations of sympathy were more subdued than usual, the rational considerations involved were dwelt upon with a minuteness and care rarely met with. Writing home was never a perfunctory duty coming round at stated intervals. The most remarkable feature of the correspondence is the revelation it affords of the closeness of the communion of thought and feeling between him and his father. With a qualification this holds true as regards his mother also. For, though aware that she took little interest in his writings, he kept nothing back from her. His almost invariable custom was to send home all letters he received, whether

relating to his writings, to his plans and prospects, or to his social engagements. In this way his father and mother were kept informed of every detail of his life. This openness on his part was reciprocated by a like openness on theirs. Rare indeed are the instances in which father and son have laid bare their minds so freely to one another. Rarer still are the instances in which father and son have for over thirty years carried on their correspondence on such a high level of thought and sentiment. Fortunate it has been for the writer of these memoirs that the son was so unsparing with his letters, and the father so careful in preserving them. They have been the main sources of information down to this time.

CHAPTER XII

PSYCHOLOGY AND DESCRIPTIVE SOCIOLOGY

(*July*, 1867—*October*, 1872)

The holiday of 1867 embraced Yarrow, Glenelg, Ardtornish, Scarborough, Stourbridge, and Standish, followed by a walking tour in Surrey with Mr. Lewes, in the course of which, passing through Weybridge, he introduced his companion to the family of Mr. Cross, afterwards to become the husband and biographer of George Eliot. His own acquaintance with Mr. Cross dated from 1858.

Views expressed in *Social Statics* had led him to be looked upon as a supporter of the admission of women to the suffrage. Hence a request from Mr. J. S. Mill in August to join a society about to be formed to promote that object. Some two months before this Miss Helen Taylor had requested permission to include, in a series of papers she was bringing out, the chapter in *Social Statics* on "The Rights of Women."

To J. S. Mill.

28 *May*, 1867.

You will, I am sure, understand that in the course of the seventeen years that have elapsed since *Social Statics* was written my thoughts on various of the matters it deals with have assumed a more complete form; and

---

Note.—*Autobiography*, ii., chaps. xli., xlii., xliii., xliv.

you will, I doubt not, sympathise in my reluctance to have reproduced in their original shape, any of them which I should now present in a better shape. At the same time, . . . I cannot, without too much deranging my plans, undertake to re-write the parts with which I am dissatisfied.

Had he been more explicit in the above letter it would have been known how far he had receded from the position held when *Social Statics* was written, and Mr. Mill would have understood that it was futile to ask him to join the proposed society. He had now to make his position clear.

To J. S. Mill.

Yarrow, 9 *August,* 1867.

Your note has reached me here, where I have been spending a few days with Prof. Masson on my way north.

Probably you will remember that in a letter some time since, written in reply to one of yours, I indicated that my views had undergone some modification since the time when I wrote *Social Statics.* The modification goes as far as this, that while I should advocate the extension of the suffrage to women as an *ultimate* measure, I do not approve of it as an *immediate* measure, or even as a measure to be shortly taken. I hold, as I doubt not you also hold, that political liberties or powers, like that of voting, are simply means to an end. That end, you would probably say, is the securing of the good of the individuals exercising such powers; or otherwise, as I should say, it is the securing of the greatest amount of individual freedom of action to them. The unhindered exercise of faculties by each, limited only by the equal claims of others, is that which the right of voting serves to obtain and to maintain. This is the real liberty in

comparison with which the right of voting is but a nominal liberty.

The question with me then is: How may this substantial liberty to pursue the objects of life with least possible restriction be most extended? And as related to the matter in hand the question is: Will giving the suffrage to women, which is in itself but a nominal extension of liberty, lead to a real extension of liberty.

I am decidedly of opinion that it will not. The giving of political power to women, would, I believe, restrict, and indeed diminish, liberty in two ways. It would strengthen the hands of authority, both political and ecclesiastical; for women, as a mass, are habitually on the side of authority. Further, it would aid and stimulate all kinds of state administrations, the great mass of which are necessarily antagonistic to personal freedom. Men in their political actions are far too much swayed by proximate evils and benefits; and women would be thus swayed far more. Given some kind of social suffering to be cured or some boon to be got, and only the quite exceptional women would be able to appreciate detrimental reactions that would be entailed by legislative action. Political foresight of this kind, uncommon enough in men, is extremely rare in women.

Of course, whoever holds that the minds of men and women are alike, will feel no difficulty of this kind. But I hold them to be unlike, both quantitatively and qualitatively. I believe the difference to result from a physiological necessity, and that no amount of culture can obliterate it. And I believe further that the relative deficiency of the female mind is in just those most complex faculties, intellectual and moral, which have political action for their sphere.

When the State shall have been restricted to what I hold to be its true function—when it has become practically impossible for it to exceed that function—then it will be alike proximately and remotely equitable that women should have political power.

To put the right construction on these reasonings of mine, you must bear in mind that to me the limitation of the functions of the State is the question of questions, in comparison with which all other political questions are trivial; and that to me electoral changes and other changes in forms of government are of interest mainly as they promise to make men freer, partly by the removal of direct injustices, and partly by the removal of those indirect injustices which all undue legislative action involves.

I greatly regret not to be able to coincide with you on this matter; and the more so because I recognise the nobility of your motive, and, could I reconcile it with my conscience, would fain follow your example.

Two years later he had an opportunity still further to explain his views.

To J. S. Mill.

9 *June*, 1869.

Thank you for the copy of your essay on "The Subjection of Women." . . .

Meanwhile I will just remark that I think the whole question, under its social and political aspects, is being discussed too much upon the assumption that the relations among men and women are determined only or mainly by law. I think a very trenchant essay might be written on the "Supremacy of Women," showing that, in the present state of civilisation, the concessions voluntarily made by men to women in social arrangements have become an organised set of laws, which go far to counterbalance the laws that are legally enacted; and that throughout a large part of society the tyranny of the weak is as formidable as the tyranny of the strong.

Mr. Mill was in full agreement with Spencer in thinking "that in a great many cases women tyrannise over

men," and "that it is generally the best of men who get most tyrannised over. But . . . two contradictory tyrannies do not make liberty."

He returned to town in the beginning of October, eager to commence the revision of the *Principles of Psychology*, about which he says in a memorandum:—

Nominally, this was a second edition, but it was more nearly to be regarded as a new work; for besides the fact that sundry of the parts were considerably further developed, there were four divisions which did not exist in the work as originally published. . . . This I had now to execute, and entered on the task with considerable zest; for I had much interest in what I saw would be the working out of the harmony between these further views and those previously enunciated.

I had a further satisfaction in the preparation of an edition more completely developing the general views which I first had set forth, since there was now a widely different attitude in the public mind in relation to this view from that which existed when the first edition was published. In 1855, this view got scarcely any attention, and what little it did get brought upon me little else than vituperation. The tacit assumption, and towards the close of the work the avowed belief, that all organisms had arisen by evolution, and the consequent conception running throughout the whole work that the phenomena of mind were to be interpreted in conformity with that hypothesis necessarily, in 1855, roused not sympathy, but antipathy. It was only after the publication of Mr. Darwin's *Origin of Species*, some four years subsequently, and only after this work, drawing so much attention—causing so much controversy—began presently to affect deeply the beliefs of the scientific world, that the views contained in the *Principles of Psychology* came to be looked at more sympathetically. . . . Not, however, that the book began at once to get that

credit which had been originally withheld; for now, with this change in the current of opinion, there came other books setting forth this advanced view, and which, with the change of the times, were sympathetically received. Especially was this so with the work of Dr. Maudsley on the *Physiology and Pathology of the Mind,* which, proceeding throughout on the evolution view of mind, and adopting the cardinal conception of the *Principles of Psychology,* without at all indicating whence that conception was derived, was reviewed with applause and had a great success. In now returning to the *Psychology,* therefore, for the purpose of further developing it, I had the consciousness that something would be done towards rectifying the arrangement in which I had got all the kicks and others the halfpence.

He was also looking ahead to the time when he would enter upon the sociological portion of his scheme, for which ample provision would have to be made. His changed circumstances, there being now no one dependent on him for support, led him to take a step he had for some time deemed desirable, namely, to get this preparatory work done by deputy. He took counsel with Professor Masson, on whose recommendation the present writer was engaged as secretary. Simultaneously, therefore, with the commencement of the *Psychology* he began to put into shape his idea of " making tabulated arrangements of historical data, showing the co-existence and succession of social phenomena of all orders." For an hour or so before dinner he would listen while his secretary, pencil in hand, read from books of travel. " Mark that," he would say when anything pertinent was met with. After familiarity with the work had in this way been gained, the present

writer was left largely to his own discretion. One of the instructions was characteristic. Impressed with the magnitude of the undertaking and the time it would occupy, he urged his secretary to avoid reading many books. "If you read, say, three trustworthy authors on any one tribe, that will be enough." This instruction had tacitly to be disregarded. For, in addition to the considerations that few travellers had the ability to note "social phenomena of *all* orders," that many had no interest in certain aspects of savage or semi-civilised societies, and that others lacked opportunities for studying any but the most superficial features of a community, there was the obvious reflection that a traveller's trustworthiness could ordinarily be ascertained only by the perusal of what he had written. Spencer's own account of these preparatory occupations is as follows:—

Some little time was passed in elaborating a method of classification, for it did not prove easy to devise any method of presenting all the phenomena of society in a form at once natural and methodic. But eventually I pretty well satisfied myself as to the system of arrangement, and by the time Mr. Duncan had been familiarised, by reading aloud to me and receiving the needful suggestions, with the nature of the work to be done and the heads to be filled up, I finally decided upon a form of table for the uncivilised races, and had it lithographed in blank form with the headings of columns. All this was done simply with the intention of having prepared for my own use the required materials. . . . But when some of the tables had been filled up and it became possible to appreciate the effect of thus having presented at one view the whole of the essential phenomena presented by each society, the fact dawned upon me that the materials as prepared were of too much value to let them

lie idle after having been used by myself only. I therefore decided upon publishing them for general use. Thereafter Mr. Duncan did his work in the consciousness that it would be not lost in the fulfilment of a private end merely, but that he would have the credit derivable from it on publication. And thus was initiated *Descriptive Sociology.*

With the year 1868 came an attack " of greater nervousness than usual." Hence the question put to Professor Tyndall: " Do you know any lively, pleasant fellow who would make a good travelling companion? " Rackets, played in a court attached to a public house in Pentonville, was resorted to again. Having never played before, the present writer was, if not a very formidable, a very exasperating antagonist; an ill-directed ball not infrequently disappearing among the neighbouring houses, to be presented a few minutes later by a messenger claiming compensation for a broken window. But Spencer took it all—broken windows and poor play—in good part. After some twenty minutes he would sit in one of the adjoining sheds and dictate for about the same length of time; then another game, and so on during the forenoon. On one occasion Professor Tyndall was persuaded to come. There was a look of amused incredulity when Spencer told him that the *Psychology* was being written in such a piecemeal fashion and amidst such unattractive surroundings. If the day was unsuitable for rackets, billiards would be resorted to. In warmer weather he would betake himself to the Serpentine, where the forenoon would be spent in rowing and dictating by turns, or to Kensington Gardens, where short periods of dictation while sitting under a

tree would be relieved by short periods of walking. With his election to the Athenæum early in 1868 a new source of enjoyment was opened up.

Having waited in vain for a "lively, pleasant fellow" as a travelling companion, he made up his mind by the end of February to start for Italy alone. About this tour enough has been written in the *Autobiography* (ii., 208-231). He was back by the middle of April not much better—"too idle and out of spirits to write letters," but hoping that, if unable to do much work, he and his secretary might "at any rate get through some reading."

The supervision of the preliminary sociological work and the state of his health furnish only a partial explanation of the slow progress of the *Psychology*. His good resolutions notwithstanding, he was continually being drawn aside from regular work. One such interruption arose out of a lecture, delivered while he was in Italy by Mr. Kingdon Clifford at the Royal Institution, "On some of the Conditions of Mental Development." Thinking that the lecture conveyed an erroneous impression as to the authorship of the doctrines discussed, he consulted Professor Tyndall.

To John Tyndall.

11 *May*, 1868.

[The lecture contains] nothing more than brief and popularised statements of some of my already published doctrines. . . . My impression is that there is scarcely a proposition, save quite familiar ones, that is not to be found somewhere or other in my book, either in the same shape or some kindred shape. . . . I feel it the more necessary not to let this occurrence pass without notice, because by it, and by another occurrence of kindred na-

ture, I am put in a very disagreeable position. . . . I am now so placed that in reproducing some of my own ideas I shall run the risk of being supposed to have appropriated the ideas of others. The circumstances are these. There was published last year, by Dr. Maudsley, a book on the *Physiology and Pathology of the Mind.* . . . Dr. Maudsley is now being cited as the authority for these doctrines which he appropriates from me. . . . See, then, my predicament. I am beginning to prepare a second edition of the *Principles of Psychology,* in which these doctrines that are being widely diffused in connection with other men's names will reappear. . . . The reproduction of my own thoughts will render me liable to the charge of plagiarism!

When the matter was brought to Mr. Kingdon Clifford's notice, he settled it to Spencer's satisfaction by means of a letter in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of June 24.

Part of the autumn holiday of 1868 was spent at Inveroran, where he had good fishing on the Orchy. In a memorandum he compares, with almost boyish satisfaction, his own success with that of two others staying at the hotel; one of whom " got up at 5 o'clock, and fished all the pools before us (Scotchman like!)." His stay was, nevertheless, cut short for the characteristic reason that he got " quite sick of the food, so wanting in variety."

Towards the end of the year his work was again interrupted. In an article on " Philosophical Biology " in the *North American Review,* for October, Mr. F. E. Abbot examines Spencer's answers to certain fundamental questions. To the question—What is the origin of life? " We find no definite reply of any sort in the volumes before us." To the question—What is the origin of species? Mr. Spencer " returns substantially the same

answer as Mr. Darwin." To the third question—What are the causes of organic evolution? Mr. Spencer traces it entirely to mechanical and physio-chemical forces, and recognises no force or forces to be called *vital* in any special sense. And yet he makes the very assumption which he condemns, namely, that of an " inherent tendency, or power, or aptitude," or an " organic polarity." He abandons the mechanical theory and practically adopts the vitalist theory. These criticisms led to what Spencer calls, in one of his memoranda, " a small controversy."

I had been charged with inconsistency because I did not accept the current doctrine of spontaneous generation, which was supposed to be not only harmonious with the doctrine of evolution as I held it, but was thought to be a part of it, which I was in consistency bound to adopt. Feeling that there was some ground for the representations made, I had to write a rejoinder, explaining my view of this question; and, as commonly happens, strove to get this done by a fixed day, thinking that I could just do this before I rested. It is always these efforts to achieve some proximate end before leaving off that do the final mischief; for nearly always the threatened mischief comes before this proximate end is reached. It did so in this case. I had to break away from my work and leave town; going first of all to Malvern, then afterwards to Ben Rhydding.

Spencer's reply (the facts and arguments of which had " the unqualified endorsement of Huxley, Tyndall and Frankland ") did not appear in the *North American Review*, as he intended it should.[1] Dr. Youmans, reflecting probably American opinion, told him the reply

[1] *Principles of Biology*, i., Appendix D, p. 696.

was " of no value for the general public—they cannot understand it. . . . Now what I wish is to take up the subject myself and put it so that they can understand it, always provided that I can arrive at a proper understanding of it myself. But before going into it I should like to hear whether you consider that the inquiry has at all changed aspects. Is it, in fact, needful for you to commit yourself to either side of the question as at present contested? "

To E. L. Youmans.

16 *March*, 1869.

Respecting the reply to the *North American Review*, you need not be alarmed at the aspect of the " spontaneous generation " question, and the way in which I have committed myself upon it. Huxley has lately been experimenting on the matter, and reaching remarkable results; and though he says that they confirm some of the observations of Pouchat, he considers that they make the hypothesis of " spontaneous generation " more untenable than ever.

It will be very well to have the ideas . . . popularised, if, as you say, it is not comprehensible to the generally intelligent. But I should like the reply as it stands to be made accessible for the benefit of such as can understand it.

While his prudence stood him in good stead in preventing him from joining the newly-formed Metaphysical Society, for the atmosphere of which his temperament would have proved ill-suited, it failed to prevent him from going out of his way, about the middle of 1869, in an endeavour to remove the anti-British feeling which had prevailed in the United States since the Civil War. This was not a sudden resolve; for, as far back as 1866, he had endeavoured to get Mr. Moncure Conway

to take the matter up. Those who have read the *Autobiography* are aware of the circumstances which led him to write the letter, as well as of the reasons that induced him to withdraw it in deference to the strongly expressed disapproval of his American friends.[1]

When he returned from Scotland towards the end of September, 1869, he had barely reached the middle of the first volume of the *Psychology*. He would fain have gone to Switzerland to see Professor Tyndall, who was laid up in consequence of an accident; but "I have been idle for so long a time, I am anxious to get some work done." It is questionable whether such an extension of his holiday would have added to his working power; for he was wont to say that Tyndall's "infectious vivacity" was too exciting. By sticking to work he succeeded in issuing three instalments of the *Psychology* between December, 1869, and March, 1870, inclusive, thus affording a prospect that the remaining part —"Physical Synthesis"—although it covered entirely new ground, would be finished before the autumn holiday. This holiday of 1870 was longer and more varied than usual. It included ten days at the Argoed, near Monmouth, with Mr. and Mrs. Potter; a fortnight with the Lotts on the north coast of Wales; and a visit to Ireland and to Scotland. Of Ireland he wrote: "I spent three days in Dublin, which has things in it worth looking at. But I found the living bad—slovenly and dirty. . . . Having heard that they had room at Inveroran, I determined to go there by way of Belfast. Belfast I found worse than Dublin—the most stinking place I was ever in, indoors and out; and I was glad to get

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 245, and Appendix E, p. 580.

away as quickly as possible." A ramble with Professor Tyndall in the Lake District, after the meetings of the British Association in Liverpool, was an enjoyable ending to his holiday.

In the expectation that the "Physical Synthesis" would be completed before he went away he had been disappointed. It "is very difficult to treat satisfactorily. But I see that it will form a very important addition to the general argument." The volume was published in December—fully three years after the revision had been begun. This seemed a favourable opportunity for carrying out his intention of dedicating the *System of Philosophy* to his American friends. Dr. Youmans was, of course, consulted: a proof of the proposed dedication being sent for suggestions. To his great surprise the proposal was strongly disapproved of. While it "no doubt would please American vanity amazingly," "it would be unjust to your sincere friends in other countries." Thereupon he cancelled the dedication and ordered the type to be distributed.[1]

The second volume of the *Psychology* progressed more rapidly than the first had done, five instalments being issued in 1871, and the three remaining in 1872. The forecast given in the following letter was to prove very far from correct. Twenty-four, instead of twelve, years were needed to finish the *Synthetic Philosophy.*

To E. L. Youmans.

12 *October,* 1872.

I have just finished the second volume of the *Psychology.* . . . I find on looking back that it is just twelve

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans,* p. 262.

years since I commenced. Having now got half through, it might be inferred that it will take another twelve years to finish. I have reason for hoping, however, that ten will suffice. Considerably more than two years, I believe, have gone in interruptions—partly due to occasional relapses of health, partly to the second edition of *First Principles,* partly to various incidental essays and articles, and partly to the arrangement and superintendence of the *Descriptive Sociology,* which, during the earlier stages, occupied much time. Indeed, now that I put them down, these interruptions account, I think, for more than two years' loss of time. As I am much better now than I was when I commenced, and as I do not see the likelihood of much incidental writing hereafter, I am inclined to hope that, after completing the *Study* [*of Sociology*], ten years will suffice to carry me through.

The other main occupation during those years—the superintendence of the *Descriptive Sociology*—was disturbed in 1870 owing to his secretary (the present writer) going to Madras. Having been led by Dr. Youmans to believe that there were many young men with the requisite qualifications who would gladly undertake the work, his disappointment was all the keener when he failed to find one. After endeavours continuing for nearly a year, he secured the services of Mr. James Collier. The printing of the extracts and tables had not gone far, when the cost began to look serious, partly owing to the manuscript being sent to the press in the original rough draft. Before leaving for India the present writer had drawn attention to the fact that the manuscript was not in a fit state for publication, and had suggested taking it with him for revision; but the risk was thought too great. One may wonder that, in view

of the cost so far exceeding his expectations, he did not suspend the work altogether. Instead of that he was on the look-out for a third compiler to undertake the Extinct Civilized Races. Through Mr. Lewes, towards the end of the year, he, for this work, entered into an arrangement with Dr. Scheppig.

The supervision of the *Descriptive Sociology* had, from time to time, suggested interesting lines of thought, tempting him to turn aside from the *Psychology*. One of these was connected with the worship of animals, his conclusions being embodied in an article in the *Fortnightly Review* for May, 1870, in which he sought to answer the question, "how primitive men came so generally, or universally, to believe themselves the progeny of animals, or plants, or inanimate bodies." Another line of thought led to the strengthening of previously formed convictions regarding the origin and growth of moral opinions and sentiments.

To E. L. Youmans.

3 *March,* 1871.

I am about, after getting rid of this forthcoming part, to make another short parenthesis in my work. The representations of my doctrine respecting the genesis of moral sentiment, which Mr. Hutton made in *Macmillan's Magazine* about a year ago, have been spreading through other channels, and I find it needful to put a stop to them. I had intended to let the matter stand over until I came hereafter to deal with it in the course of my work: but Mr. Hutton will now have to pay the penalty a good deal sooner. I am going to prepare the article for the next *Fortnightly.*

To Charles Darwin.

3 *March,* 1871.

What I have read [of the *Descent of Man*] has surprised me by the immense accumulation of evidence, interesting in itself and doubly interesting by its implications, which you have brought to bear on the questions you discuss. I had no idea that such multitudinous proofs of the action of sexual selection were forthcoming.

I am glad that you have so distinctly expressed your conviction on the more special question you treat. It will, I doubt not, raise afresh the agitation on the general question; since many who have in a considerable degree reconciled themselves to the conception of evolution at large, have never had represented to them, in a positive way, these ultimate implications of it. Many such will doubtless fight against them; and out of the fighting there is sure to come further progress.

I very much wish that this book of yours had been issued somewhat earlier, for it would have led me to introduce some needful explanations into the first volume of the *Principles of Psychology,* lately published. One of these explanations I may name. Though I have endeavoured to show that instinct is compound reflex action, yet I do not intend thereby to negative the belief that instincts of some kinds may arise at all stages of evolution by the selection of advantageous variations. I believe that some instincts do thus arise; and especially those which are operative in sexual choice.

The *Descent of Man* indirectly led to another "parenthetical" bit of work, foreshadowed in the following letter:

To Charles Darwin.

2 *May,* 1871.

It has occurred to me that it may be worth while to write a few lines to the *Contemporary Review à propos*

of Sir A. Grant's article.[1] I think of drawing his attention to the *Principles of Psychology* as containing proofs both analytic and synthetic, that the division between Reason and lower forms of Intelligence, which he thinks so unquestionable, does not exist.

Before deciding on this course, however, I think it is proper to enquire whether you propose to say anything on the matter; seeing that the attack is ostensibly directed against you.

Apparently Mr. Darwin was not induced to take the matter up. Hence the short paper on "Mental Evolution," published in the *Contemporary* for June, to which reference is made in a letter to Dr. Youmans (5 June).

I enclose a brief article just out. I wrote it partly as a quiet way of putting opinion a little right on the matter. Since the publication of Darwin's *Descent of Man,* there has been a great sensation about the theory of development of Mind—essays in the magazines on "Darwinism and Religion," "Darwinism and Morals," "Philosophy and Darwinism": all having reference to the question of Mental Evolution, and all proceeding on the supposition that it is Darwin's hypothesis. As no one says a word in rectification, and as Darwin himself has not indicated the fact that the *Principles of Psychology* was published five years before the *Origin of Species,* I am obliged to gently indicate this myself.

Towards the end of the year he was drawn into a controversy with Professor Huxley, whose address on "Administrative Nihilism," while dealing with the objections raised to state interference with education, criticised adversely the view that Government should be restricted to police functions, and set aside as invalid the

[1] "Philosophy and Mr. Darwin," *Contemporary Review* for May.

comparison of the body politic to the body physical, worked out by Spencer in the article on "The Social Organism." Spencer replied in the *Fortnightly Review* for December in an article on "Specialised Administration," expressing at the same time his reluctance to dwell on points of difference from one he so greatly admired.

"The *Nation*," wrote Dr. Youmans (May, 1869), "gave you a little thrust the other week, and our friend, Henry Holt, of the firm of Leypoldt and Holt (publishers of Taine), took them to task in last week's paper." The "little thrust" was made in the course of a notice of Taine's *Ideal in Art*, in which it was said that "it is Herbert Spencer's reputation over again; all very well for the 'general public,' but the chemists and physicians, the painters and the architects, are disposed to scoff at the new light." The point of this innuendo must have been very illusive, for when first Mr. Holt, and afterwards Mr. Fiske, adduced evidence to prove that, taking Spencer as a philosopher, "it is clearly not the 'experts' that do the scoffing," the editor retorted that both of them had missed it.[1] "The correspondence in the *Nation*," wrote Dr. Youmans, "has elicited a good deal of comment, not concerning your doctrines, but yourself. Emerson, Agassiz, and Wyman are quoted against you on the ground that a man who attempts so much must be thin in his work." Spencer could treat such criticisms with equanimity, knowing the esteem in which he was held by experts.[2] Mr. Darwin, for example, showed no inclination to scoff. "I was

[1] The *Nation*, from 20 May to 3 June, 1869.
[2] *Life and Letters of C. Darwin*, ii., 301. *Autobiography*, ii., 242.

fairly astonished," he writes, " at the prodigality of your original views. Most of the chapters [of the *Biology*] furnished suggestions for whole volumes of future researches." Nor did Spencer write to Mr. Darwin as if he were liable to be scoffed at by the great naturalist. Witness the following (dated 8 February, 1868), written on receipt of the *Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication:*

I have at present done little more than dip here and there—paying more special attention, however, to the speculation on " Pangenesis," in which, I need hardly say, I am much interested. It is quite clear that you do not mean by " gemmules " what I mean by " physiological units "; and that, consequently, the interpretations of organic phenomena to which they lead you are essentially different from those I have endeavoured to give. The extremely compound molecules (as much above those of albumen in complexity as those of albumen are above the simplest compounds) which I have called " physiological units," and of which I conceive each organism to have a modification peculiar to itself, I conceive to be within each organism substantially of one kind—the slight differences that exist amongst them being such only as are due to the slight modifications of them inherited from parents and ancestry. The evolution of the organism into its special structure, I suppose to be due to the tendency of these excessively complex units to fall into that arrangement, as their form of equilibrium under the particular distribution of forces they are exposed to by the environment and by their mutual actions. On the other hand, your " gemmules," if I understand rightly, are from the beginning heterogeneous —each organ of the organism being the source of a different kind, and propagating itself, as a part of succeeding organisms, by means of the gemmules it gives off.

I must try and throw aside my own hypothesis and think from your point of view, so as to see whether yours affords a better interpretation of the facts.[1]

The year before the *Nation* made its "little thrust," Dr. Hooker, in his presidential address to the British Association, gave Spencer's observations on the circulation of the sap and the formation of wood in plants, as an "instance of successful experiment in Physiological Botany." "It is an example of what may be done by an acute observer and experimentalist, versed in Physics and Chemistry, but above all, thoroughly instructed in scientific methods." Another expert, Mr. Alfred R. Wallace, in his Presidential Address to the Entomological Society in January, 1872, spoke of Spencer's view of the nature and origin of the Annulose type of animals as "one of the most ingenious and remarkable theories ever put forth on a question of Natural History," and as "a most promising line of research."

Such were the opinions of "experts." Here is the opinion of one who, if not an expert in any branch of natural science, was one of the leading thinkers of the time.

From J. S. Mill.

2 *December,* 1868.

This I may say, that I have seldom been more thoroughly impressed by any scientific treatise than by your *Biology;* that it has greatly enhanced my sense of the importance of your philosophical enterprise as a whole; and that, altogether apart from the consideration of what portion of your conclusions, or indeed of your scientific premises, have yet been brought into the domain of

[1] See *Life and Letters of C. Darwin,* ii., 260, 262.

proved truth, the time had exactly come when one of the greatest services that could be rendered to knowledge was to start from those premises, simply as a matter of hypothesis, and see how far they will go to form a possible explanation of the concrete parts of organisation and life. That they should go so far as they do, fills me with wonder; and I do not doubt that your book, like Darwin's, will form an era in thought on its particular subject, whatever be the scientific verdict ultimately pronounced on its conclusions; of which my knowledge of the subject-matter does not qualify me to judge.

Academical honours were of no value in his eyes, except as indications that his work was appreciated. He declined to be put forward for the Lord Rectorship of the University of St. Andrews, or to be nominated for the degree of LL.D.,[1] or to accept an honorary membership of the St. Andrew's Medical Graduates' Association. To the Secretary of the Association he stated his reasons in full (December 16, 1871).

Some years ago, while occupied in biological enquiries, I should doubtless have been able to make much use of the advantages which such an election would have given me; but I fear that, as now my studies lie almost wholly in other directions, these valuable facilities will be almost thrown away upon me. Doubtless it is true that honorary memberships in such cases are not supposed to imply habitual participation, either in the advantages or in the proceedings of the bodies giving them. . . .

Beyond the general objection I have to all names and titles that are not descriptive of actual function, there rises before me in this case an objection of another order, which will very possibly be regarded as no less peculiar. I see that one of the purposes of the Associa-

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 272-273.

tion is " the maintenance of the interests of the Medical Graduates of the University." . . . I think that very probably any public action the Association might take would be one I should disapprove. The doctrines I have long publicly held respecting the functions of the State and the liberties of the subject, are of a kind quite at variance with the policy pursued by the Medical Profession, when it has brought its combined power to bear upon legislation. . . . I fear that this letter will be regarded as a very ungracious response to the compliment which your Association has paid me. But, as I hope your Council will see, my course is one taken altogether irrespective of the particular circumstances. The principles I have indicated are principles long since adopted, and from which I have not hitherto swerved.

The French translation of *First Principles* was expected to appear early in 1868. When spring of the year following came without any sign he was " beginning to get a little anxious." About the middle of 1870 he found out that the delay was due in part to the difficulty experienced in preparing the prefatory note, which was growing to the dimensions of a volume. There were three points Dr. Cazelles wished to bring out: " To determine your place in the experimental school; to trace the evolution of your idea of Evolution; in fine, to mark the differences which separate your philosophy from the only scientific generalisation known in France—the positivism of Comte." To this Spencer replied at great length in June, 1870, tracing the development of his thought. Being now in possession of the required information, Dr. Cazelles expected to have the translation published in July or August, little thinking of the disaster that was about to overtake his country.

To E. Cazelles.

10 *March*, 1871.

I have not endeavoured to communicate with you during this period of dreadful disaster for France that has elapsed since I last heard from you about midsummer, 1870. My silence has been partly due to the feeling that the entire absorption of your thoughts and feelings by these unhappy events made attention to any other matters out of the question; and partly to the belief that during this reign of confusion, a letter would very likely not reach you. Now that I do write it is more to express my sympathy with you in this time of national misfortune, than because any matter of business requires me to write; for I conclude that, in the state of prostration under which France must for some time suffer, literary activity is likely to be almost entirely suspended. My chief hope is that when social order becomes fairly re-established and the corrupting effects of the imperial *régime* partially got rid of, the result may be a turning of the national energies into more healthful channels.

The long-delayed translation at length saw the light during the troublous days of the early summer of 1871. Neither Dr. Cazelles nor M. Ribot could tell how the book had succeeded in escaping from Paris. The Introduction pleased Spencer greatly.

To E. Cazelles.

3 *May*, 1871.

The lucidity of your brief statements is admirable, and, in many cases, presents to me my own ideas with a freshness and neatness which gives them almost the effect of novelty. Indeed, I cannot better express the effect produced on me by what I have read, than by saying that it seems to me as though I were looking at myself in a glass, not having before known " what manner of

man I was," as seen externally. This effect is in part due, I doubt not, to the comparative brevity with which you have sketched out the *System of Philosophy* in its essentials—so giving me, free from superfluous details, that which is habitually present to me under more involved forms, and in part to the quite different *order* in which you have exhibited these essentials. This new concatenation, considerably unlike that through which my thoughts habitually run, enables me to judge of the *ensemble* from a fresh point of view, and thus gives me an impression of it which I can look at as though it proceeded from some one else. . . . I am so struck by its lucidity and by the vividness due to a presentation of the main features in rapid succession, that I should like very much to have it diffused in a separate form. . . .

I should some time since have replied to your letter of March 21st, had not the occurrence of this dreadful second disaster in France [the excesses of the Commune] led me to suppose that a letter would probably miscarry. I wish I could do something towards mitigating that despondency which must accompany the view you take respecting the future of France. I wish this the more because in the interests of civilisation at large, as well as in the interests of France, I should be glad to find rational grounds for taking a more favourable view than that which you take. But, though I shall hope to see society in France re-organise itself in a more satisfactory form, I cannot with candour say that my hope is at all a sanguine one. It has seemed to me for these many years past that from some cause difficult to trace (race, or the particular mixture of races, being perhaps at the root) there has arisen an obstacle to further development. The nature of the social units seems to have become different from that required for a higher type of social structure, and, in fact, there seems to be no type that is suitable. In the *average* French nature there appears to be an intolerance of despotism along with an unfitness for freedom—or, at least, if these characters do not co-

exist in the same individual, they co-exist in the individuals of the same society, and prevent that society from organising itself into a type under which the units can co-operate harmoniously.

10 *July.*—I am glad to see affairs in France assuming so much better an aspect and promising tranquillity for some time to come, at least. I should have greater hope for the future were there not already so many indications that the dominant feeling is that of revenge, and were there not a consequent determination to still further exhaust the national resources by military preparations, and so to entail a further retardation, if not arrest, of social growth.

Unknown to Spencer, M. Ribot had already completed a translation of the original edition of the *Psychology.* It was now arranged to substitute a translation of the new edition. Meanwhile, to give the public some idea of the psychology of evolution, M. Ribot wrote, for *La Philosophie Positive,* an article which M. Littré had agreed to publish, but on seeing it drew back. " Without contesting the great merit of M. Herbert Spencer," wrote M. Littré, " there are between him and us differences so profound that we could not receive your article as it is." He was willing to publish the article, however, on condition that it were " transformed into an exposition pure and simple."

CHAPTER XIII

THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY

(*December*, 1869—*January*, 1874)

The adoption of a general title for the *System of Philosophy*, reluctantly laid aside in 1867, came up again in connexion with Mr. Fiske's lectures at the Harvard University, which were published as delivered in the New York *World*, then owned by Mr. Manton Marble. Spencer was gratified to know that his philosophy was to be expounded by a disciple so able and enthusiastic, but the title of the course was not to his liking.

To E. L. Youmans.

4 *December*, 1869.

I am very much annoyed that he should have used the title he has done. . . . What he has called Positive Philosophy . . . has little or nothing in common with the philosophy of Comte; for even the relativity of knowledge, joined with the *deliberate ignoring* of an unknown cause of phenomena is a quite different thing from the relativity of knowledge joined with the *deliberate assertion* of an unknown cause of phenomena. And while this general doctrine, which Fiske calls Positivism, is not what the Positivists mean by that title, it is a doctrine which is held by those who distinctly repudiate the name Positivists. So far as I can judge from his programme . . . a title, which is applied both by its ad-

Note.—*Autobiography*, ii., chaps. xliii., xliv., xlv., xlvi.

herents and opponents to one system of thought, he is applying to another system of thought, the adherents of which do not acknowledge the title. Among other evils, one result of this will be that all who wish to direct against the doctrine of Evolution such objections and prejudices as have grown up against the system of Comte, will be able to cite justification for doing this.

To John Fiske.

2 *February*, 1870.

If the word " Positive " could be dissociated from the special system with which he [Comte] associated it, and could be connected in the general mind with the growing body of scientific thought to which he applied it, I should have no objection to adopt it, and by so doing accord to him due honour as having given a definite and coherent form to that which the cultivated minds of his time were but vaguely conscious of. But it seems to me as the case stands, and as the words are interpreted both by the Comtists and by the public, the amount of correct apprehension resulting from the adoption of the word will be far out-balanced by the amount of misapprehension produced.

In so far as I am myself concerned, I still hold that the application of the word to me, connotes a far greater degree of kinship between Comte and myself than really exists. . . . Such elements of my general scheme of thought as you have brought into prominence as akin to those of Comte (such as the relativity of knowledge, and the de-anthropomorphisation of men's conceptions) . . . *have been all along quite secondary to the general doctrine of evolution, considered as an interpretation of the Cosmos from a purely scientific or physical point of view.* . . . If you bear in mind that *my sole original purpose* was the interpretation of all concrete phenomena in terms of the redistribution of matter and motion, . . . you will see why I regard the application of the word

Positivist to me as essentially misleading. *The general doctrine of universal Evolution as a necessary consequence from the Persistence of Force is not contained or implied either in Comtism or in Positivism as you define it.*

By the end of the following year Mr. Fiske had come to the conclusion that Spencer was right " in refusing to accept the appellation ' Positivist ' in any sense in which it is now possible to use the word. . . . I should like also to know what you think of the terms ' Cosmic Philosophy ' and ' Cosmism.' " To these also Spencer objected. Thinking the time had now come to give effect to his former intention, he set aside the reasons that had been urged against the title " Synthetic Philosophy,"[1] and forthwith had a new general title-page inserted in the unsold copies of *First Principles, Biology,* and *Psychology.* His objections to " Cosmic " and his reasons for choosing " Synthetic " are set forth in a letter to Mr. Fiske in 1872 or 1873.

To put my view in its most general form, I should say that a system of philosophy, if it is to have a distinctive name, should be named from its method, not from its subject-matter. Whether avowedly recognised as such or not, the subject-matter of philosophy is the same in all cases. . . . Though every philosophy is more or less synthetic, it seems to me that that which formulates and elaborates the " Doctrine of Evolution " is synthetic in so especial a manner that it may fitly take from this peculiarity its distinctive title.

It is synthetic as recognising avowedly that philosophy is a synthesis of all knowledge—that which unifies the partial unifications achieved by the several sciences.

[1] *Supra,* p. 172.

It is synthetic as uniting Science and Nescience as the correlative parts of an integral conception of the Universe.

It is synthetic as recognising each derivative law of force as a demonstrable corollary from the ultimate law, the Persistence of Force.

It is synthetic as proceeding consciously to the interpretation of phenomena as caused by a co-operation of forces conforming to these derivative laws.

It is synthetic as proceeding to deduce from the general law of the redistribution of matter and motion the successive orders of concrete phenomena in their ascending complexities.

Further, it is synthetic under sundry more special aspects as combining and reconciling opposing views—as those of the transcendentalists and the experimentalists.

And yet once more it is synthetic in its conception of the Universe as objective, since it regards the progress of things which brings about evolution as being itself a synthesis—a reaching of more and more complex products through successive increments of modification.

Mr. Fiske did not think "that Synthetic, any more than Cosmic, will apply, as a *distinctive* name to your philosophy. The differential mark of your philosophy is, not that it is Synthetic or that it is Cosmic, but that it is based upon the conception of Evolution as opposed to the conception of Creation."[1] The term Cosmic would, however, in Dr. Youmans's opinion, "probably come under popular use in this country. Nothing short of the Cosmic will satisfy the American spread-eagleism."

Into the project for an "International Scientific Series" Spencer entered with the utmost cordiality, the proposed arrangements seeming to "practically

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans*, pp. 290-92, note †.

amount to international copyright."[1] The international character of the scheme gave occasion for the clashing of interests, the exciting of jealousies, unlooked-for delays, and many disappointments. After some six months negociations in Europe Dr. Youmans found, on returning to New York, that American writers had to be propitiated. "There was unanimous and much bitter complaint on the part of the press at the absence of any American element, and it was urged upon me all round in the interest of the undertaking that the omission should be supplied as early as possible." From the side of the public came complaints of overlapping of subjects, of over-prominence given to certain topics, and of inequality in the amount of matter. Even the size of the page agreed upon had to be strictly adhered to. "Books of that kind we cannot sell," wrote Dr. Youmans, with reference to a proposal to introduce a larger paged book into the series. Altogether, the task which Professor Huxley, Professor Tyndall and Spencer took upon themselves when they agreed to act as a London Advisory Committee, proved by no means light. On Spencer from the very outset fell the burden of the Committee's work.

Spencer's hands being full, he had at first no idea of himself contributing to the series. But for several years he had been impressed with the necessity of preparing the way for Sociology by an exposition of the method by which, and the spirit in which, the phenomena of society should be studied. Failing to find any one to do this, or to collaborate with him in doing it, he at

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans*, pp. 266-94. *Autobiography*, ii., 265, 270-71.

last yielded to Dr. Youmans's persistent suggestion that he should write the book himself and include it in the Series. The result was an arrangement that the *Study of Sociology* (the name to be given to the book) should first appear as articles in the *Contemporary Review*, with simultaneous publication in an American periodical, about the standing of which he was very particular.[1] No sooner had Dr. Youmans seen the first article than he made up his mind to start a magazine (the *Popular Science Monthly*) forthwith, with this article in the opening number. Spencer was rather taken aback to find that the articles got so little attention in the United States. Of the chapter on "The Bias of Patriotism," he writes:—

As its contents are varied, and part of it has a considerable interest distinct from that of the argument in general, its length will perhaps not be objectionable. Especially, I suppose, the castigation of Arnold will excite some attention. . . . You will see how the sales of my books are increasing. If things go on thus, I shall make a fortune by philosophy.

For the chapter on "The Political Bias," he had asked Dr. Youmans to send him "a supply of typical illustrations of the way in which your political machinery acts so ill—its failures in securing life, property and equitable relations. I want to use the case of America as one among others to show how baseless is the notion that the form of political freedom will secure freedom in the full sense of the word."

Mr. Martineau's article in the *Contemporary Review* for April, on "The Place of Mind in Nature, and In-

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans* p. 295.

tuition of Man," caused a brief interruption in the *Study of Sociology,* for the purpose of writing a reply. To this he refers in the course of a letter to Dr. Youmans: "I have just had a very enthusiastic letter from Darwin [1] about the article, which is, of course, satisfactory; for I feel since the article was published that he might think I ought to have referred to him personally in connexion with the doctrine defended."

To Charles Darwin.

12 *June,* 1872.

I cannot consent to let your letter pass without saying how much gratified I am by your approval. I should very well have liked, had time permitted, to deal somewhat more fully with the metaphysical part of Mr. Martineau's argument. If, as I expect him to do, he makes some reply, it will probably furnish the occasion, after an interval, for a fuller exposition; by which I hope to make clear to quite ordinary apprehensions, the absolute emptiness of all such propositions as that with which Mr. Martineau deludes himself and his readers.

To J. E. Cairnes.

21 *March,* 1873.

At present I have done nothing more than just dip into your essay on *Laissez-faire.* Without being quite sure that I seize your meaning exactly, I feel inclined to object to that current conception of *laissez-faire* which you appear to accept and argue upon. You say that "the able men who led the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws promised much more than this. They told us that the Poor Laws were to follow the Corn Laws; that pauperism would disappear with the restrictions upon trade, and the workhouses ere long become obsolete institutions."

[1] *Life and Letters of C. Darwin,* ii., 344.



CHARLES DARWIN.

Now as a Poor Law is itself a gross breach of *laissez-faire,* in what I conceive to be the true meaning of it, this passage seems to me to be tantamount to an expression of disappointment that obedience to *laissez-faire* in one direction has not cured the evils caused by continued disobedience to it in another direction.

I do not think that *laissez-faire* is to be regarded simply as a politico-economical principle only, but as a much wider principle—the principle of letting all citizens take the benefits and evils of their own acts: not only such as are consequent on their industrial conduct, but such as are consequent upon their conduct in general. And while *laissez-faire,* as I understand it, forbids the stepping between these private acts and their consequences, it is quite consistent with the doctrine that a government should, far more effectually and minutely than at present, save such individual from suffering evils or claiming benefits due to the acts of others.

About this time he became acquainted with Mr. Arinori Mori, the Minister of Japan to the United States. "He came," says Spencer, "to ask my opinion about the re-organisation of Japanese institutions. I gave him conservative advice—urging that they would have eventually to return to a form not much in advance of what they had and that they ought not to attempt to diverge widely from it."

Spencer's aversion to self-advertisement comes out in his reply to a suggestion made by Dr. Youmans regarding the final chapter of the *Study of Sociology.*

To E. L. Youmans.

3 *June,* 1873.

To your suggestion that in the concluding chapter I should outline the coming treatment of the subject in the *Principles of Sociology,* I fear I cannot yield. The

concluding chapter, as I have outlined it, in thought, will make no reference whatever to the *Principles of Sociology*, and could not do so without an obvious departure from the proper limits of the book. To the advantage that might result from indicating the scope of the *Principles* I am entirely indifferent—about any probable increase of sale I do not care in the least. Indeed, so far from being tempted by an opportunity for something like an advertisement, I should be tempted to avoid it if it came naturally. Even as it is, I feel a certain distaste for the inclusion of the two chapters, "Preparation in Biology" and "Preparation in Psychology"; since these may be regarded as indirect advertisements of my own books. I would escape this implication if I could; and I shall solicitously avoid any such further implication.

His sojourn in Scotland this year was cut short owing to "very bad weather, very little amusement, and unsatisfactory health." Taking into account the expediency of proceeding at once with the *Principles of Sociology*, one would have thought he would have avoided outside entanglements. But the writing of the *Study of Sociology* had revived his former active interest in the question of the separation of Church and State, leading to meetings and discussions with those in favour of the movement.[1]

In the last chapter of the *Study of Sociology* he had singled out Mr. Gladstone as "the exponent of the anti-scientific view." Mr. Gladstone repudiated the interpretation put on his words: "Whether there be or not grave differences of opinion between us, they do not arise from the words in question." Spencer thereupon withdrew the erroneous construction, and took steps to coun-

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 303-304.

teract it.[1] Thinking the small controversy between them had thus been amicably terminated, Mr. Gladstone did not read the proof which Spencer had sent him showing how it was proposed to correct the misinterpretation in future editions. When he did look into this some five weeks afterwards, he found there a reference to the other passage quoted, the manifest meaning of which he had not disclaimed. This "other passage," Mr. Gladstone wrote, had not been disclaimed because it was not in the *Contemporary Review* article, but appeared for the first time in the book itself. Moreover, "you can hardly have taken the pains to read the words you have quoted —they speak, as you will see on perusing them, of a third person—and they run thus; '*it would seem that is his view.*' . . . That which I describe as the opinion of the man I am condemning, you quote as my opinion."

To W. E. Gladstone.

14 *January*, 1874.

I greatly regret that any act of mine should have called for your letter of the 12th—regret it alike for the reason that your valuable time has been thus expended, and for the reason that you have found just cause of complaint against me.

Let me at the outset, however, draw your attention to the fact that, having forwarded to you before it was printed, a proof of the addition I proposed to make to the volume, it is manifest that such misrepresentation as is chargeable against me, however otherwise blameworthy, was not committed consciously. . . .

But now proceeding to the points at issue, let me say that I by no means admit all that you allege against me. A large part of the allegation is founded on an over-

[1] *Study of Sociology*, note 5 to chapter xvi.

sight almost as remarkable as that which I have myself made. . . . For the "new passage" which I am said to have "introduced" into the volume, and which directly and by implication is said not to have been in the *Contemporary Review, was* in the *Contemporary Review*. . . .

But now having, as I think, conclusively shown that one of the two complaints against me is unfounded, I go on to admit that the other is well founded. . . . How I came so to misconstrue the sentence as to ascribe to you that conception of the attitude of Science towards Providence which you ascribe to another, I do not know. It was a piece of stupidity which, when I read your letter at the Athenæum, I could scarcely believe I had been guilty of; and it was not until I returned home and referred to the volume, that I became convinced I had been thus careless where I ought to have been specially careful.

With respect, however, to the *essential issue,* I cannot see that I have misapprehended or misstated your position. . . .

Returning, however, to the immediate question, I will forthwith erase the final paragraph of my comment on your letter, and in its place put one apologising for the misconstruction of the sentence referred to. . . .

Hoping that you will forgive me for having unintentionally entailed on you so much trouble and annoyance.

It was now Mr. Gladstone's turn to apologise. Even were he inclined, he said, to push matters to extremes he felt that he had forfeited all title to do so by having himself committed an oversight which he thought quite equal, to say the least, to Spencer's. "I am glad," he added, "a correspondence has occurred which proves your anxiety not to wound or misrepresent, and I shall be further glad if circumstances should, with your per-

mission, allow our acquaintance to be improved." To this Spencer responded: "It is almost superfluous on my part to say that I very gladly reciprocate the wish with which you obligingly close your note."

The *Descriptive Sociology,* upon which he had drawn largely in writing the *Study,* was making increasing calls upon his time and his purse. His friends in America wished to relieve him of the cost of Dr. Scheppig's volumes, but their proposals were declined owing to his annoyance at reports respecting the aid which had been rendered by Americans and the embarrassments from which he had been rescued by them. While holding this decision to be mistaken, Dr. Youmans felt that "there is nothing for me but acquiescence under the circumstances, but I do not agree to it as a final thing." "I am not certain about the general policy to be pursued, having been a good deal demoralized by your refusal of the movement we had planned." Eager and energetic as usual, he was ready to undertake any amount of work to promote the sale. But Spencer would neither himself push the sale at home, nor sanction arrangements proposed for pushing it in America.

To E. L. Youmans.

11 *July,* 1873.

The undertaking gives me an immense amount of worry and trouble, and seriously hinders other work, and I cannot entertain any plans that will involve re-arrangements and give further trouble. You must just do the best with the thing as it comes to you. If it is profitable, so much the better. If not, it cannot be helped. The first consideration with me is to have this organisation of materials available for my own use; the second, that of

making it available for general use. The third consideration, of a greater or smaller amount of profit, weighs with me but little.

15 *July.*—I fear that my last letter, written in a hurry, was somewhat too directly expressed, and that the negation of your proposed plans may have been a source of annoyance. Pray forgive me if it was so.

27 *September.*—I am quite content to give my labour for nothing. I am content even to lose something by unrepaid costs of authorship; but it is clear that I shall not be able to bear the loss that now appears likely.

12 *November.*—Referring to the business arrangement of the *Descriptive Sociology* in America, I shall prefer to have it on a mercantile basis; and believe that on the terms I proposed, I shall be able to carry it on, if not without loss, still without greater loss than I can bear. I have carried it on thus far single-handed; and I purpose to continue it in the same way.

The interval between the completion of the *Study of Sociology* and the beginning of the *Principles of Sociology,* offered an opportunity for carrying out the intention, referred to in the first paragraph of the article on Mr. Martineau, of dealing with the chief criticisms that had from time to time appeared on the general doctrine of Evolution as set forth in *First Principles.* While he was engaged on this the *Quarterly Review* for October, 1873, had an article, "respectful, though antagonistic." Simultaneously there appeared in the *British Quarterly* an article also antagonistic, but, as he thought, not respectful. These led him to write a postscript dealing with the new points raised. Of this he says to Dr. Youmans (12 November): "I enclose the postscript to the 'Replies to Criticisms,' which runs to

a greater length than I intended. It is desirable, however, that these attacks in the *Quarterly* and *British Quarterly* should be effectually met. That in the *Quarterly* is clearly by Mivart, and that in the *British Quarterly* is by a man named Moulton (a senior wrangler, I hear)." A portion of the proof of the reply to the *British Quarterly* was kept back to be used or not at the discretion of his biographer.[1]

A rejoinder by the *British Quarterly* reviewer led to another from Spencer when issuing his *Replies* in the form of a pamphlet. Before this, however, he had told Dr. Youmans: " You will see that the reviewers are both pretty effectually disposed of. Tyndall and Hirst have both verified my position against the *British Quarterly*. Tyndall thinks that Tait will very likely show fight. I hope he will, I shall be down upon him still more heavily if he does." Professor Tait did " show fight." His letter in *Nature* of 26 March, 1874, initiated a correspondence in the pages of that journal, on the nature and origin of physical axioms, which continued for months, even after the original combatants had retired from the contest.[2]

A few matters of interest, more or less outside his main pursuits, may be gathered from the correspondence.

To E. L. Youmans.

16 *February*, 1872.

On Friday I had the latest news of Huxley. He wrote from Malta and was beginning to get over his depression.

[1] The "Replies to Criticisms" is reprinted in *Essays*, ii., 218; for the postscript dealing with the Quarterlies, see p. 258.

[2] *Nature*, 26 March, 1874; 2, 16, 23, 30 April; 7, 14, 21, 28 May; 4, 11, 18 June; 20, 27 August. *Essays*, ii., 298.

We are using influence to get out to him a peremptory official order *not* to return in time to finish his course of lectures, as he had intended to do.

22 *March.*—The publishers here have done what I expected they would do—make a counter-move trying to commit the authors to combined action with them. They have hooked a few, and leave no chance unused to hook others; for they have actually written to me to join their Committee!

8 *April.*—Tyndall is obviously nettled by my attack on the men of science in the *Contemporary* article—[1]taking it as personal; which, indeed, remembering some discussions we have had, he has some ground for doing. He says it is well for me that his hands are full; betraying, at the same time, an amusing unconsciousness that it is possibly well for him also.

9 *December.*—Huxley is beginning decidedly to improve. He has been building a house, and migrates to it next week.

This migration was the occasion for one of those interchanges of expressions of mutual regard that go so far to sweeten life.[2] In replying to Spencer's reference to their long-standing friendship, Professor Huxley wrote: "You do not set a greater value on our old-standing friendship than I do. It has been the greatest pleasure to me to see the world in general gradually turning to the opinion of you which is twenty years old in my mind." A further proof of Spencer's affection was shown in the active steps he took along with other friends to enable Professor Huxley to take a much needed rest.

---

[1] The *Study of Sociology*, chapter i.
[2] *Life of Profesor Huxley*, i., 394.

To Charles Darwin.

26 *April*, 1873.

I rejoice with you that our plot has succeeded so well —beyond expectation, indeed.

One thing, I think, remains to be done. Huxley talks of taking a long holiday "in the summer." I think he must not be allowed to postpone taking it. He must go away at once, and to that end we ought to put pressure on Foster.

I have been to see Tyndall about it, and he agrees in my proposal to write and ask your opinion.

We might send a joint letter to Foster (which you would write) giving emphatic expression to our opinion in the matter; and judging from what Farrar said when I saw him, there will probably be no difficulty.

The death of Mr. J. S. Mill in May of this year brought Spencer "a serious deprivation." In an obituary notice in the *Examiner* (17 May), he gave expression to his sense of the public and private loss sustained by the passing away of one, distinguished alike by the force and perspicacity of his intelligence and by the loftiness of his moral character.[1]

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 289, 594.

CHAPTER XIV

DISTASTE FOR HONOURS AND CEREMONIAL

(*January*, 1874—*December*, 1877)

SPENCER'S "abortive attempt to keep a diary" during 1874, affords little help to his biographer. The entries, few and meagre, occur only in January and March. On 4 March, there is an entry: "Breakfasted with Mr. Gladstone"—a carrying out of the wish expressed by both at the conclusion of their controversy.

Efforts were being made to induce him to join the Royal Society.

To J. D. HOOKER.

28 *March*, 1874.

Since our brief conversation some two months ago I have repeatedly considered your kindly expressed wish that I should join the Royal Society; and, that I may not fail in treating the overture with due appreciation, I have decided to set down my thoughts on paper.

When, on several occasions during recent years, the like suggestion has been made to me, my response has, I doubt not, seemed eccentric. I have a dislike, perhaps morbid in degree, to the tendency shown in the Royal Society, as in the community at large, to hang on to the skirts of the titled class. The maintenance of special facilities for the admission of peers, and the appointment, as Presidents, of men who, but for their rank, would not have been thought of as appropriate, have

NOTE.—*Autobiography*, chaps. xlix., l.

always seemed to me to imply a disrespect for science which the Royal Society should, above all bodies, have avoided showing. When, not very long since, a nomination to the Council was advocated by Sabine, then President, on the ground that the nominee had induced two peers to become Fellows, the continued existence of this feeling was clearly proved, and it was the continued existence of this feeling which I remember giving as my objection, the last time the question of my joining the Society was raised at the X (Asa Gray being, I remember, our guest on the occasion). Since then, there has doubtless been a great improvement. Your own election as President, in preference to the Duke of Devonshire, has illustrated it in a striking way; and the pending proposal to alter the rule respecting the admission of peers, further shows it. So that, were there no other reasons, this would now be no deterrent.

Other reasons, however, remain. In the case of the Royal Society, as in the case of other learned bodies, there grows up, in addition to the first purpose, a second purpose, which eventually becomes predominant. Co-operation for the advance of knowledge is the original purpose; the wearing a badge of honour is the derived purpose; and eventually the derived purpose becomes more important than the original purpose. Now badges of honour of this kind are beneficial or mischievous according to circumstances. When given to men early in their careers, they serve them as authoritative endorsements; and thus diminish the difficulties to be contended with. When, contrariwise, they are not given, an increase of these difficulties results. Absence of the endorsement becomes an additional hindrance. The world at large, little capable of judging, and led by marks of this kind, thinks lightly of those who do not bear them, and pays relatively less attention to anything they do. There arises, in fact, to use a sporting metaphor, a kind of inverse handicapping—a system under which those who, from youth or other causes, are already at a disad-

vantage, are artificially disadvantaged still more; while those who have already surmounted their difficulties have their progress artificially facilitated. Evils arise from this, of which my own experience has made me conscious. If, within a moderate time after the publication of the *Principles of Psychology* in 1855, a proposal to join the Royal Society had been made to me, it is possible that the hope of having my path made somewhat easier might have over-ridden the feeling described above. But during the long period throughout which I was frittering away what property I possessed in publishing books that did not pay their expenses, there came no such aid. There came, rather, the hindrance which, as I have said, results from the non-possession of a mark of distinction possessed by others—a hindrance shown at home by the long neglect of my books by the press, and abroad by the absence, until recently, of translations. The natural difficulties, which are quite great enough and often prove fatal, and were more than once nearly proving fatal in my own case, are thus made greater than natural. That many aspirants should be killed off in the struggle to gain recognition, may be, on the whole, salutary; though, among them, adverse circumstances probably extinguish some of the best. But I think it undesirable that the natural struggle should be made artificially more severe for those whose circumstances are already unfavourable. I do not by any means intend to imply that the Royal Society has not, in many cases, endorsed men at those early stages when its endorsement was valuable. So far as it has done this, let the fact be recognised; and so far as it has not done this, let the fact be recognised; so that there may be a balanced judgment respecting the extent to which the presence or absence of its endorsement is to be taken as a test.

Yet a further motive, more exclusively personal than the last, weighs with me—the motive which prompted my remark to you that "I thought it was too late." Next year, my career as an author will have extended

over a quarter of a century. Were I now to become a candidate for the Royal Society, and to be elected, the interpretation generally put upon the fact would be that only now, after this long period, has the propriety of such an election become manifest. A tacit admission to this effect, I feel disinclined to make. And in addition to the feeling which disinclines me to make it, I have a suspicion that it might not be altogether politic; so tardy an election would, I think, be rather damaging to me than otherwise.

Thus you see that I have sundry motives for still holding back. Though my great respect for you, personally, and the desire to yield to your friendly overture, led me for a while to waver; yet, after repeatedly thinking the matter over, my original reasons and feelings have reasserted themselves. I regret that it is so; and that I am obliged thus to make what I fear you may regard as an ungracious response.

The English translation of Dr. Cazelles' Introduction to *First Principles* was now (May, 1874) ready for the press. It had at one time been intended that Mr. Fiske should prepare it; "but," wrote Spencer in May, 1871, "a reason has occurred to me for not asking him. The name is doubly odious here just now—not only because of your finance schemer of that name, but also because the name is also that of an American who is implicated in a horrible scandal now before our courts." The title selected for the translation may cause surprise to one who has in mind the correspondence a year or two before about the title "Synthetic Philosophy." "'Synthetic Philosophy' would be a damper to most, even when it was intelligible, which it would be to but few. 'Evolution Philosophy,' will, on the contrary, be attractive, and will convey some idea of the book."

The following refers to a lecture by Dr. Youmans before the Liberal Club, New York, on "Herbert Spencer and the Doctrine of Evolution."[1]

To E. L. Youmans.

20 *June*, 1874.

Of course, I cannot but rejoice at the complete success of your address and exposition.

But while it is a source of satisfaction to me to have such able defence and advocacy, I see abundant reason to congratulate *you* upon the clearness and power of that which is wholly your own. Your sketch of the pre-existing state of opinion, and of the irrational compromise which had been made by scientific men is admirable; and you bring into a vivid light their failure to recognise the changed position of things that had grown up, and the necessity for a total reorganisation of thought. So well have you put the matter that everyone who reads may see that such a change was impending; and that the last generation of scientific men, narrowly disciplined by their special studies, were incapable of seeing it.

You have put in immense claims for me; and doubtless greatly astonished your audience, and will greatly astonish also the more numerous readers of your address. . . .

I see you finally decided to have your say about Emerson. It is very pungent, and will, I should think, cause considerable sensation. If as you say, controversy has been growing hot, we may expect it to grow hotter, now that you have added to it these burning criticisms.

His persistent defence of his originality and independence was associated with an equally persistent repugnance to anything that had the appearance of blowing, or conniving at blowing, his own trumpet. His dis-

[1] *Edward Livingston Youmans*, p. 325.

like of self-advertisement made him hesitate as to the publication in London of Dr. Youmans's eulogistic lecture either separately or as an appendix to the English translation of Dr. Cazelles' Introduction. Written, as its author said, for the meridian of New York, it might, Spencer feared, compromise him if published in the meridian of London. Similarly, when towards the end of the year he learnt that some verses "gracefully written and eulogistic in a high degree," which Mr. Grant Allen had sent him,[1] had also been sent to Mr. Morley for publication in the *Fortnightly Review,* he decided that it would never do to have them published with his cognisance.

"Pray do not fail to reach Belfast by August 19," he wrote to Dr. Youmans, in view of the Meeting of the British Association there, under the presidency of Professor Tyndall. This meeting cut down his holiday in Scotland to about one month. The earlier portion was spent with Mr. and Mrs. Holt at the Dell of Abernethy, on Speyside, and the latter portion at Ardtornish.

To Mrs. Holt.

Ardtornish, 5 *August,* 1874.

By the time this reaches the Dell, I suppose you will have returned to that comfortable nest where you left your little ones—finding them, I hope, all well.

My journey went on without hitch—weather good and times fitting as intended. The drive along the shores of Loch Laggan was well worth having—quite new to me and bearing comparison with other fine scenes which Scotland offers.

. . . I have spent the time in fishing, with tolerable success. Not to you perhaps, but to Mr. Potter . . . it

[1] *Memoir of Grant Allen,* p. 55.

may be worth stating the results:—Saturday, 13 sea-trout weighting 15 lbs., and Monday one salmon of 7 lbs. and 15 sea-trout weighing 9 lbs. . . . I hope it has been different on the Spey, and that your papa has done better than I did. Mr. Holt, too, has, I hope, not come home empty-handed three times running!

My best way of thanking you for your kind hospitalities will be to tell you how very much stronger I found myself than I expected. On Monday my 8 hours continuous fishing, which would have quite exhausted me a fortnight ago, did not make me more than pleasantly tired—all the result of life at the Dell.

To E. L. Youmans.

28 *August,* 1874.

You would have enjoyed the Belfast meeting. It went off very well, and Tyndall's address, though it called forth many sermons, was otherwise well received. Huxley's lecture, too, was a great success. The occurrence of the two together is regarded as a throwing down the gauntlet.

6 *November.*—I suppose that with you, as here, the formation of opinion is increasing at a great rate. Tyndall's address has greatly added to it. The newspapers make it a topic, letters are published, pamphlets issued; and there is a continual increase of magazine-essays and books, dealing with one or other aspect of the general question. The results are coming to be altogether incalculable. There seems to be no knowing what a few years might bring forth.

One of the most remarkable signs is that Mivart is commencing in the *Dublin Review* a most elaborate examination of the *Principles of Psychology.* He is actually taking it chapter by chapter, and proposes, in successive articles, to go thus through the whole of it! So far as I have seen, his criticisms are the merest quibbling; which, besides being baseless, do not in the least

touch the general issues. But I am quite content: he will doubtless aid in the further diffusion of the work. The current number of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* had an article by M. Janet, of the French Institute, on the *Study of Sociology*. I have not yet had time to read it; but see that it is appreciative, though critical. Morley, too, tells me that he is going to have an article on it in the *Fortnightly* by Professor Cairnes.

One of the results of the awakened interest alluded to was the starting of a journal of mental science by Professor Bain—a project in which Spencer took a great interest, and in the initiatory stages of which he assisted Professor Croom Robertson with his counsel.

It is time that something was said about the *Principles of Sociology*, for the writing of which the way seemed clear in the spring of 1874. The protracted course of the *Psychology* had come to an end; the exciting episode of the *Study of Sociology* had attracted the notice of a wider public than any of his previous books; the *Replies to Criticisms* had squared accounts with opponents; and the sociological materials he had been accumulating by proxy for the past six years were now in a sufficiently advanced state for use. It is true that his anxieties about the *Descriptive Sociology* had not grown less as the work progressed. Its importance urged him to push on; the outlay urged him to hold back. His letters on the subject took their colour from whichever of the two feelings happened to be uppermost at the time. " Sir Rutherford Alcock, our late minister in Japan, who is preparing an article on Japan for the next *Quarterly*, told me that he had found it [the ' English '] of immense service in comparing Japanese feu-

dalism with English feudalism." "I begin to hope that eventually, though slowly, the cost of production will be repaid, or at any rate nearly, so that I shall not be prevented from going on." This fear of being "prevented from going on" was at the bottom of his anxiety. About one of the schemes that emanated from Dr. Youmans's fertile brain he writes in August, 1874: "The matter is too marvellously involved to allow of my clearly understanding all the bearings of the proposal you give in the space of a single sentence." The "marvellously involved" scheme arose out of a generous offer of £500 from Mr. Edwin W. Bryant, of St. Louis.[1] "The anticipation that I should have to stop or to lose has, of course, as you know, been my own anticipation. But, as you know, I do not care for this if I do not lose more than I can bear. The miserable ambition of merely scraping together money, is one with which I have so little sympathy that I can scarcely comprehend it." In January, 1875, he was hopeful, "My other books are prospering so well that I shall be able to carry on. . . . So that I am in good spirits, notwithstanding the heavy drafts on my resources." Next month the other feeling was uppermost. "It is clear that, as things now look, I must stop." The volumes already begun must be published; "but after this is done I shall be disinclined to sacrifice further large sums and give myself continued trouble for the benefit of so incredibly stupid a public."

When he mentioned in the spring of 1873 that he did not expect to issue the first number of the *Principles of Sociology* before going on his holiday, he little thought that March of 1874 would find him with only about sixty

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 314.

pages of manuscript ready. About the second instalment he writes in November: "I am delighted with the piece of work I now have on hand. The genesis of superstitions has been slowly improving with me into a coherent doctrine for years past, and has now become quite clear and complete." The third instalment was out in February, 1875. They were now appearing too rapidly for Dr. Youmans, who, as editor of a journal appealing to the general public, was finding their destructive character somewhat embarrassing; more especially seeing that the "great irritability in the theological mind, since Tyndall's bomb-shell" had not yet been allayed. Occasionally the heterodox ideas were met by ridicule in place of censure, as in the instance alluded to by Spencer in a letter of 22nd January, 1875: "I enclose you two *jeux d'esprit* which will amuse you. The one from *Punch*[1] is admirably witty. I wish Tyndall had done what I urged him—asserted more emphatically that the atom is but a symbol."

To E. L. Youmans.

14 *April*, 1875.

You are quite right as to withholding from the *Monthly* the chapters I sent you [chapters xvii. to xx.]. I sent them merely because you requested it. I have often had qualms as to the policy of making the *Monthly* a propagandist organ to so large an extent; and I am rather glad than otherwise that you are limiting this use of it. Especially it is, as you think, wise to do so in respect of these present chapters; and the forthcoming ones are still stronger. Indeed, I am beginning myself to have some fears as to the effect; for, as you will by and by see, this constructive set of chapters is so

[1] 16 January, 1875, "Address to an Atom."

utterly destructive (far more so than is manifest at present) that it leaves nothing standing. I cannot see how the so-called orthodox can fail to be made furious by it. But the thing has to be done.

Among the extra bits of work this year was the revision of several chapters of *First Principles* to meet the criticisms of Professor Tyndall.

To John Tyndall.

24 *March,* 1875.

I send the enclosed, thinking that if it reaches you before you leave town for Easter, you may perhaps find time, during the recess, to cast your eye over the more important of the changes I have made; and to add to my already heavy obligations, by telling me whether you think your objections have had the desired effect.

You need not, I think, trouble yourself to re-read the chapter on the "Indestructibility of Matter." I have duly attended to all the points noted in it, and have put at the end of it a sufficiently emphatic note concerning the meaning of *à priori.* The chapter on the "Continuity of Motion" is, most of it, quite transformed; and is now, I think, not so far from what it should be. I am very glad you have persisted in making me think it over again, and recast it. It is now at any rate very much better than it was.

Respecting the chapter on the "Persistence of Force," I still find myself unable to take the view that "Conservation" is a good word, and that "Energy" suffices for all the purposes. By an added sentence or two, I have sought to make this point clearer.

Mr. Sidgwick's representation in the *Methods of Ethics* of some of the views contained in *Social Statics* he could not accept as correct.

To Henry Sidgwick.

12 *January*, 1875.

In the chapters from which you quote—"Derivation of a First Principle"—it is, I think, sufficiently manifest that my purpose is not to assert the law of the freedom of each limited only by the like freedom of all, as a sufficient guide for individual action. It is represented as a first principle to be subsequently limited by secondary principles—a "law of right *relationship* between man and man"; to be qualified by further restrictions originating in the judgment of the individual. It is concluded that in drawing "deductions respecting *the equitable constitution of society*, we may safely assert in full this liberty of each limited alone by the like liberty of all"; but it is not thereby concluded that this liberty to exercise the faculties bounded only by the like liberty of others, is a sufficient guide for the individual—the contrary is indicated. The aim of the chapter is to assert the basis of *justice*. But justice is not alleged to comprehend all ethical restrictions: there are distinct statements to the contrary. The purpose is to establish what claims of the individual are to be held valid against the claims of other individuals (*i.e.* society) to control them. And it leaves the actions of the individual to be further controlled by his own judgment—does not in the least assert that he ought to give free play to all his instincts regardless of the dictates of reason. My assertion that this free play of the whole nature within the assigned limits may be safely left to mould the character by adaptation, through the experiences of pleasures and pains, is not in the least the proposal that "reason is to abdicate in favour of instinct," as you state. The assertion is that within the assigned limits of equal freedom, the accumulation of experiences by the individual, suffering and benefiting by his own conduct, and checking himself by his own judgments (wise or foolish as the case may be), will work out a beneficial adaption more

certainly than will the enforcing of additional restraints by the *reason of society* as embodied in *law*—a reason inevitably vitiated by the ignorance and defective sentiment of the time.

I quite recognise the fact that in ascribing to me "a negation of the natural supremacy of reason over impulse," you are presenting a paradox which elucidates your argument; but it is somewhat too much at my expense.

In May, 1875, he began to write the *Autobiography*. His thoughts naturally turned towards his boyhood.

To George Holme.

14 *May*, 1875.

I was very much pleased to hear some time ago, that you had been elected Mayor of Derby. It was a well deserved recognition; and I am glad that it was not longer delayed. It crowns very satisfactorily that long career of deserved prosperity which, beginning gradually in the days when we first knew one another, has gone on with increasing speed. Little did we suspect what the future would bring forth on the day when you saved me from being drowned. Little did the spectators, who saw a dripping youth conducting home a half-drowned boy, think that the one would rise to be chief magistrate of the town, while the other would become—well, somewhat widely known. The recollection must ever continue to be a source of satisfaction to you as of gratitude in me.

In an article written for *Nature*, Mr. D. A. Spalding drew attention to an inconsistency arising out of Spencer's assumption "that feelings stand in a causal relation to bodily movements."

To D. A. Spalding.

5 *July*, 1875.

The implication of your argument seems to be that I identify motion as it actually exists with motion as manifested to our consciousness. Did I do this there would be the inconsistency you allege in the supposition that feeling is transformable into motion and motion into feeling. . . . But that transformation which I assume to take place (though without in the least understanding how) is the transformation of the subjective activity we call feeling (unknowable in its ultimate nature) and the objective activity we call motion (also unknowable in its ultimate nature). . . .

Simply stated, my position everywhere implied is that the objective activity is inscrutable, the subjective activity is inscrutable, and the relation between the two is inscrutable. But looking at the facts of nervous organisation and function I find myself obliged to hold that the two are in some way related, though I cannot conceive how. I find myself also obliged to recognise the fact that they are quantitatively related; and the fact of quantitative relation implies transformation.

In December of the following year this question of the relation between mind and body came up again, in a correspondence with Professor Höffding, who had translated a selection from the *Essays* into Danish.

From Harald Höffding.

Copenhagen, 14 *December*, 1876.

I beg leave to ask you for some information with regard to some places in your works, in which I, after repeated study, believe to find an inconsistency. . . .

(1) In your *First Principles*, § 71 [ed. 1867], you teach: "The law of *metamorphosis*, which holds *among the physical forces*, holds equally *between them and the mental forces.*" In the same work, § 194, it is said to

be " a necessary deduction from the law of correlation that what exists in consciousness under the form of feeling, is *transformable into* equivalents of all the other forces which matter exhibits." In the *Principles of Psychology,* § 47 [ed. 1870], the relation between a physical change and the psychical change accompanying it is compared with the relation between heat and motion.

(2) But in " Corrections and Additions " to the first volume of the *Principles of Psychology* it is said: " Of course I do *not* mean that material actions thus *become* mental actions. . . . I am *merely* showing *a parallelism* between certain physical changes and the correlative psychical changes." With this agrees *First Principles,* § 143, *Principles of Psychology,* § 221 and § 469. It is here said, that the evolution of consciousness follows the general law of evolution, but that it cannot be explained by deduction from the persistence of force, while such a deduction is possible with regard to its obverse, the development of physical changes in a physical organ.

As for me, I believe that these last-named places explain the real state of the problem. I also believe that [they] express your real doctrine.

To Harald Höffding.

London, 18 *December,* 1876.

Your letter of the 14th needs no apology on the score of giving me trouble. Contrariwise I feel indebted to you for drawing my attention to the inconsistency you name. It is due partly to the fact that some qualification of the view originally expressed in *First Principles* has actually taken place, as was stated in the earlier part of the *Psychology;* and it is in part due to imperfection of expression which I did not observe. Until now that you draw my attention to the fact, I had forgotten that it was needful to make some modification of statement in the passage to which you refer, in *First Principles,* so that it may harmonise with the more detailed exposi-

tion set forth in the Data of Psychology. And it did not occur to me that the quotation you make from the " Corrections and Additions " is so expressed as to seem incongruous with what had been previously stated. As you may infer from various other passages, my conception, inadequately expressed by the word " parallelism," is better expressed by describing the subjective states as forming an *obverse* to those objective states described as physical changes. And by " parallelism " I meant to indicate the fact that throughout these changes, physical on the one face and psychical on the other, there is maintained a definite relation such that the increases and decreases of the one are accompanied by increases and decreases of the other. The word parallelism, however, is misleading to a certain extent, inasmuch as it supposes that the series of psychical changes is outside of, and separate from, the series of physical changes. This, however, is not my view. I conceive the mental force manifested in consciousness to be the actual correlate of the physical forces which arouse it, and of the physical forces which it thereafter initiates; not, indeed, as I have explained in the Data, a quantitative correlate, either of the change initiated at the place where the stimulus is applied, or of the quantity of motion evolved in a muscle: but the quantitative correlate only of such nervous discharge as is produced *in the centre of sensation.* My view of the relation between the mental force we know as consciousness, and the physical forces which initiate it on the one side, and which it initiates on the other, may be best understood by the analogy which I have sometimes used in discussing the matter with friends. If you cut the copper wires which join the positive and negative poles of a galvanic battery, and between the two ends interpose a piece of platinum wire, then when the circuit is completed, the galvanic current passing through the copper wires without sensible change in them, raises the interposing piece of platinum wire to white heat (supposing the current is strong enough).

If, now, we suppose that the one piece of the copper wire represents an afferent nerve, and the other piece of copper wire an efferent nerve, while the interposed piece of platinum wire represents the sentient centre to which the stimulus is brought and from which the motor impulse is discharged, then this raising of the platinum wire to a state of incandescence by the passage of a current through the entire arc, may be taken as symbolising the evolution of consciousness in the sentient centre that accompanies the entire nervous discharge, constituted on the one side by the sensory impulse, and on the other side by the motor impulse. Of course this is simply a symbol, inasmuch as you are well aware that I do not regard the nervous discharge as in any sense electrical; but it seems to me conceivable that the form of force which in us constitutes consciousness, is correlated with the force which in shape of an afferent stimulus initiates it, and with the form of force which it afterwards initiates as a motor discharge, in a way similar to that in which this incandescence is correlated with the strength of the electric discharge. Thus looking at the matter, it is possible dimly to see how consciousness is related both to the physical force which initiates it, and to the physical force which it initiates; and how it varies in intensity with each of them, at the same time that it remains incomprehensible how the transformation takes place, and what the force constituting consciousness is. And it becomes also possible to conceive how the psychical action is the obverse of the physical action which initiates it, and again of the physical action which it initiates. Consciousness may, from this point of view, be regarded roughly as a kind of transverse section of the entire arc of nervo-motor change. It occurs at a place in the arc where there is a certain resistance to a passage of the physical discharge (and this we see to harmonise with the fact that repetition of the discharge until it becomes automatic ends in cessation of consciousness). So regarding the facts we may say that that form of the ultimate

force which we symbolise as motion (and this is to be regarded simply as our *symbol* for a certain form of the ultimate force) is under certain conditions presented by a sentient nervous centre, changed into that other form of the unknown ultimate force which constitutes a state of consciousness, and that this, subsisting for a moment, becomes again instantly transformed into the previous state of the unknown force which we symbolise as motion. This view must be joined with the view which I have repeatedly elsewhere expressed, that both these forms of force are in themselves but symbolic of the Unknowable Power of which they are both manifestations, and that the distinction between them is essentially this: that what we call our consciousness is a circumscribed portion, while that which we think of as unconscious or physical, is simply that which lies outside the circumscribed portion called consciousness. Thus regarding the matter we shall not be perplexed by the supposed impossibility of the transformation of the physical into the psychical.

I am, as I say, obliged to you for pointing out these incongruities of statement, and will take care in subsequent editions to modify the expressions so as to avoid them.

The passages referred to were modified in subsequent editions. As regards the above letter, Professor Höffding informed the present writer in 1904 that he could not at the time, "and cannot yet find it quite clear."

After spending August, 1875, at Ardtornish, he went to Llandudno. The day after his arrival he wrote to his late hostess.

To Mrs. Smith.

Llandudno, 29 *August,* 1875.

I need not say literally where I am—I say it pictorially. The representation serves a further purpose; that

of showing you how judiciously I let myself down gently from the glories of Scotch scenery to the ugliness of London streets. The contrast would be too violent without the intermediate picturesqueness.

I did not reach this till yesterday—a day later than I intended. This was all due to the crowded state of the "Iona." How so? you will ask. Well, the sequence is not very manifest, but it happened thus. The multitude of passengers led to a crush at dinner; the crush involved difficulty in getting what was asked for; inability to get whisky led me to take beer; the beer gave me a headache; the headache made me decide that I was unfit for a night journey; this decision determined my stay in Glasgow for the night, and hence I could not take the Liverpool route and had to come by Chester. So you see the causation is quite clear—almost as clear as that which I was thinking of the other day when lying on the river-bank at Acharn after eating my lunch; namely, that had not Mr. Smith seen the advertisement of the Achranich estate, the thoughts of a good many people in America, France, Germany, Italy, Russia and other places would not have been quite the same.

To E. L. Youmans.

29 *November*, 1875.

The new edition of Bain has reached me.[1] I think it greatly improved and though he takes to the doctrine of Evolution in rather a gingerly way, still, he has made a great step for one brought up under the *régime* of pure empiricism. The book is admirable from a natural history point of view. I met recently a very promising young biologist, Mr. Romanes, who had been making some important and highly instructive researches on the nervo-muscular actions of the medusæ. He brings out facts which he says justify in a most remarkable manner

[1] *The Emotions and the Will.* Compare Bain's *Autobiography*, p. 324.

the speculations respecting the genesis of the nervous system set forth in the fifth part of the *Psychology*.

When intimating his approaching marriage, which was to take place in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey, Professor Tyndall wrote: "I should like to see you, but you may have scruples that I know not of. So I shall not be angry if you abandon me." And abandon his friend he did, though not without a wrench.

To John Tyndall.

24 *February*, 1876.

I wish you were going to be married by registrar. It would delight me extremely on all accounts, and I would, in such case, travel from John o' Groat's to be with you.

But as it is—Well, I have repeatedly tried to reconcile myself to the idea of being present, but without success.

Pray forgive me. None the less heartily shall I wish you every happy sequence to the wedding, though I am not present at it.

In February, 1876, he was elected a foreign correspondent of the Accademia dei Lincei.

To the Council of the Reale Accademia dei Lincei.

11 *March*, 1876.

The diploma and accompanying letter, informing me of my election to foreign membership of the Roman Academy, reached me a few days since.

That this recognition by the countrymen of Galileo, and by the members of a learned body which dates from his time, is a source of gratification to me—a gratification in large measure due to the implied fact that the views with which I am identified are obtaining attention—scarcely needs saying.

Of course, along with this satisfaction of an imper-

sonal kind, there is joined some personal satisfaction; it is impossible for me not to receive pleasure from a mark of esteem given by so select a society. This expression of pleasure I desire to emphasise the more, because I must join with it the explanation that I have, up to the present time, not availed myself of any scientific distinctions, or marks of honour—of a kindred kind. I entertain the belief that all titles which are not descriptive of functions, are, in the end, injurious—that the effects which seem directly beneficial are more than counterbalanced by indirect effects that are detrimental.

Too large a space would be required were I to state in full the reasons which have forced this belief upon me and have led me to decline scientific honours in England. I may, however, give the chief reason by quoting a passage from my reply to the President of the Royal Society, on the last occasion on which I was invited to become a candidate for fellowship [see p. 223, paragraph beginning " Other reasons "].

The conviction which prompted me to take the course thus intimated, not with respect to the title of F.R.S. only, but with respect to other titles, is one which I still entertain, and in conformity with which I must continue to act. If, therefore, it is observed that on the title-pages of my books, my name appears without intimation of that corresponding membership which the Roman Academy has honoured me by according, it must be observed that its absence is accompanied by the absence of all other titles.

In the following year, under the impression that the Roman Academy had not conferred upon him the highest honour in its power, he addressed the Secretary (24 September, 1877), requesting his name to be removed.

Being, as implied by the facts I named, indifferent to academic honours in general, it may naturally be supposed that if honours of the first class did not effectually

attract me, honours of an inferior class would be wholly unattractive. . . . Had I understood the matter at the time when I received the offer of the distinction . . . I should without hesitation have declined it. What I should at once have done then, I am anxious to do now without further delay. Will you therefore oblige by directing that my name be erased from your list, and that any other steps requisite for cancelling my election be taken forthwith?

Signor Quinto Sella, the President of the Academy, hastened to remove the misapprehension. "Your letter impressed me painfully" (he wrote October 1, 1877). "I fear you have thought that the Fellows of the Roman Academy have not for you and your highest services to science and humanity the esteem that you and they deserve. But such a thought is quite contrary to the truth." The distinction between *soci stranieri* and *soci correspondenti* did not, he explained, indicate the Academy's estimate of scientific merit. By its statutes the number of *soci stranieri* was limited to ten, and there was a natural wish, if not a duty, to show special recognition in the first place, to those who had devoted themselves to old Roman history, institutions, and language, or who had rendered important services to modern Italy. "The task was easier for the election of the *correspondenti.* The number is greater, and they are divided by the statutes between the different branches of knowledge. The first election of *correspondenti stranieri* in the class of moral sciences ended February 7, 1876. Three Fellows were to be elected, one for historical, one for philosophical, and one for social and political sciences. Your name came out in the first election with the utmost votes,

i. e., seventeen votes upon twenty-one voters *scattered in the different parts of Italy.*" An election with such a result, Signor Sella considered so high an honour, that he felt justified in urging Spencer not to insist on the purpose expressed in his letter of September 24. His retirement would "give to the distinction between *soci stranieri* and *correspondenti* a character which is not the intention of the Fellows of the Academy," and would "be the source of troublesome embarrassment. Certainly your wish is not to damage those who honestly intended to show to you their highest esteem." Signor Sella added that he had requested a colleague of the Academy, the Marquis Menabrea, the Italian Ambassador, to seek an interview with Spencer in order to remove the erroneous impression.

To Quinto Sella.

October, 1877.

When proposing to take the step indicated in my recent letter, which seemed to me called for by regard for my position, I did not, of course, wish in any way to give offence to the members of the Roman Academy, still less to entail on them any such difficulty with respect to the distinction of classes as that which your letter of the 1st indicates; and I should regret to pursue a course which should have these results. . . .

Your letter by its details sufficiently shows me that there was not on the part of the Roman Academy any intention to make such a distinction as that which the classification nominally expresses. . . .

As, however, I should be reluctant to create any disagreeable feeling and further difficulty, and as I gather from General Menabrea that this inclusion in the second class is not likely to be permanent, I yield to your repre-

sentations and agree not further to press the request made in my letter to you.

In July of the following year he was transferred to the class of *soci stranieri*.

He had been invited in 1874 to stand for the Lord Rectorship of the University of Edinburgh, and in the following year for that of Aberdeen. Though in both cases he declined the honour, his refusal was not so unqualified as in the case of St. Andrews. In reply to the overtures from Edinburgh he said:—

If, as seems not improbable, I should, in years to come, be capable of undertaking more work than at present, I might, should the wish be expressed by many of the students, assent to a nomination as candidate for the Rectorship, and in the event of being honoured by their choice, should gladly avail myself of the opportunity afforded of doing what I could towards educational reform.

To the Aberdeen Committee his answer was more encouraging still:—

I should like very much to respond affirmatively to your question and to accept the implied invitation of your fellow-students. There are some views fit for an inaugural address, which I should gladly find an occasion to set forth. I must, however, resist the temptation.

A renewal in October, 1876, of an invitation to lecture at the Royal Institution met with the same response as before.

As years go by I feel more and more that life is short and philosophy is long. . . . Were there no such reason

I should very willingly yield to your suggestion, and if I decline I must beg you to interpret my decision as entirely due to this peremptory requirement that I shall economise my time and energies to the uttermost.

Ceremonial functions had no attractions for him. Towards some of them he had indeed an invincible repugnance, nurtured in early life by the precept and example of his father, and adhered to in after life on principle. In May, 1874, he was invited to an "At Home" at the Foreign Office, "To have the honour of meeting His Majesty the Emperor of Russia;" but regretted that he could not avail himself of the invitation. "The necessity of wearing a levee dress, to which Mr. Spencer has an insuperable objection, compels him to decline the offered pleasure." On being informed that Lady Derby would be sorry to be deprived of the pleasure of his company from a question of costume, and suggesting that he might come in ordinary evening dress, he wrote again.

Mr. Herbert Spencer is greatly indebted to the Countess of Derby for her kind concession. Not having foreseen any such contingency, Mr. Spencer finds himself in a position for which he was not prepared.

While in the habit of disregarding conventions in ways not *too* obtrusive, Mr. Spencer feels that to make himself a solitary exception in so conspicuous a manner on such an occasion would be even more repugnant to him than conformity itself. Further, he sees that his act, inevitably ascribed to other motives than the true one, would subject him to the disagreeable comments which a wrong interpretation would excite. Thus explaining his difficulty, Mr. Spencer hopes that the Countess of Derby will not regard him as perverse if he does not avail himself of her kind permission. . . .

Fearing lest his course may seem to imply an undervaluation of the privilege conceded, Mr. Spencer yet trusts that the least unfavourable construction will be put upon it.

A few extracts may be given from a memorandum of his doings during the holiday of 1876:

July 22.—Corran Ferry. Read by daylight at 10 at night.

August 5.—Reached the Dell. While at the Dell continued reading McLennan.

16.—Left for Kingussie and Fort William.

17.—Drive from Banavie to Arisaig—the most beautiful drive in the kingdom, as far as I have seen.

24.—Reached Mrs. Mitchell's at Laidlawstiel. Stayed till August 31. Walking, talking, driving, playing lawn tennis, and making memoranda of Domestic Institutions.

To Mrs. Holt.

Steamer "Iona," 22 August, 1876.

I am, as you see, on my way south. The fishing [on the River Morar] was a delusion. The alleged 2½ miles of river specified in the *Sportsman's Guide* dwindled to 1 mile. I gathered on approaching the place that only half a mile was worth fishing; and on inspection this half mile shrank to 150 yards! Further, in this 150 yards there were but three practicable casts; and in all but one of these, you were more likely than not to lose your salmon when you had hooked him! When with this was joined the lowness of the water and the continual fineness of the weather, you may understand why I so soon changed my address.

I had, however, some compensation in the beauty of the scenery my journey carried me through. Though the cost of posting more than forty miles gave me a prospective pain in the pocket, yet I was quite reconciled

by what I saw. The drive from Banavie to Arisaig exceeds in number and variety of picturesque views any drive in Scotland I have seen; and that is saying a great deal. If you should ever be in that region, pray do not forget it. I am about to write to my friends at Ardtornish, suggesting that they should go in their yacht to Banavie, drive across, and be taken up by it on the other side.

Early in 1874 Spencer had urged, as a reason for Dr. Youmans coming to London, that the International Scientific Series "evidently wants a spur—some of the authors are lagging, and it is quite time that measures were taken for finding successors to them." A difference of opinion had also arisen between the publishers and the London Committee. The relations of this Committee to the publishers on the one hand and to authors on the other had never been defined. According to Spencer, "we are bound as a Committee to see that the understanding with authors who wrote for the series should be fulfilled. . . . I shall have a talk with Huxley and Tyndall upon it." Dr. Youmans reminded him that Professors Huxley and Tyndall "at the outset declined to have anything to do with the matter if it involved the slightest correspondence or business, or anything more than the giving of an opinion now and then in regard to the competency of writers. So, to protect the Committee from annoyance that would have been sure to follow publicity, I carefully refrained from having their names published." He feared, therefore, that any attempt to get them to move in the matter "might lose us the moderate benefits we now derive from them." Dr. Youmans had already begun to weary of an enter-

prise which at the outset was so full of promise. "The 'Series' seems to be in a very bad way (internationally), and I don't know but we shall have to let it go; it was a quixotic project and I doubt if it is worth much further attention."

To E. L. Youmans.

7 *October,* 1876.

I daresay you have observed in the two last numbers of the *Contemporary Review* two ferocious and utterly unscrupulous attacks on Huxley, Tyndall, and myself by Dr. Elam. The misrepresentations are throughout of the most unblushing kind. I was very nearly in the last number publishing a brief letter giving a sample, and indicating others, but was dissuaded by Tyndall and Lewes from taking notice of them. He evidently was shown a proof of my letter before I withdrew it, and has in consequence put an apology to his second article —an apology, however, which really, unawares, commits him to a still more serious predicament. It is possible that I may still take up the matter in a general article under the title of the "Ethics of Theologians" or the "Ways of Theological Critics," giving examples from Kirkman, Mivart, Elam, and probably also from Canon Birks, who, I see, has just announced a book in which he avowedly makes an attack on *First Principles.*

The purport of the letter referred to, which was withdrawn after he had corrected the proof, may be gathered from the following sentences:—

Much space would be required to expose all Dr. Elam's misrepresentations. I should have to instance words put within quotation-marks in such a manner as to seem mine, which are not mine. I should have to instance sentences quoted alone, which derive all their significance

from the adjacent sentences omitted. I should have to instance cases where that which is shown by the context to be a supposition is, by detachment from the context, made to appear an affirmation.

When on a visit to Mr. and Mrs. Potter in November Spencer saw a good deal of Bishop Ellicott, for whom he had a great regard.

To E. L. Youmans.

25 *November,* 1876.

You would have been amused had you heard the conversation. As I was saying afterwards, he is a typical sample of religious opinions of the advanced type at the present time, which reminds me very much of the condition of a piece of furniture that has been attacked by white ants, which are said to honeycomb and eat out all the interior, and leave the exterior apparently unchanged —the result being that eventually the whole thing some day suddenly comes down with a crash.

The first volume of the *Sociology* would before now have been completed but for the fact that as he proceeded it dawned upon him that he had made a serious omission in not having included "Domestic Relations" in his original scheme. He had been working at this since some time before he went on his holiday in 1876; but the subject had grown upon him, and November found him some way from the end. He was "undecided what to do. There are four chapters which I ought to add to the part on 'Domestic Relation' to complete all that I intended to say, and which seem to be called for by the requirements of the subject." Nevertheless, he decided to issue the volume in December without these four chapters. Exaggerated rumours about his health had

spread both here and in America, calling forth many letters of sympathy: one being from Professor Bain, who was himself the object of regretful references in the United States early in the following year.

FROM E. L. YOUMANS.

9 *February*, 1877.

We had a great scare about the death of Bain. It was cabled over, and as there was no Alexander Bain in the Cyclopædias but him of Aberdeen, our friend was obituarised next morning in all the papers of the country. We all felt very badly about it, of course, and I wrote an elaborate leading article for the *Monthly*, which was just ready to stereotype, when we learned that it was the wrong man. I wrote to Bain that I was quite disgusted at having to throw away so much excellent work, and cudgel out something else at the last moment.[1]

TO E. L. YOUMANS.

14 *March*, 1877.

I write immediately on the receipt of your letter, which reached me this morning, *a propos* of your remarks concerning Appleton's article on "Copyright" in the *Fortnightly*. Pray write a brief letter to the *Fortnightly* rectifying his misstatements. It is important to do so especially at the present moment. There is now sitting a Copyright Committee which is entertaining some most monstrous proposals, going far to abolish copyright; and it is needful to do everything which tends to resist these proposals. I am myself giving evidence before it—have given part and have yet more to give. I hope we shall succeed in smashing the scheme, but it will not do to let any effort be neglected.[2]

[1] The Alexander Bain who died in 1877 was the author of several important telegraphic inventions.

[2] *Various Fragments*, p. 19.

26 *May.*—I ought to have written sooner. . . . But I have been very shaky. I have had to postpone many things. Among other distractions there has been the need for rectifying Tylor's statement in *Mind* [April, 1877], and there has also been the need for replying to McLennan's two articles in the *Fortnightly,* which I have done in some papers appended to the last of them. Yesterday I took to the printers the last few pages of the *Sociology,* all which will be in type this evening.

With a view to remove the impression conveyed in *Mind* that in his Ghost theory he had adopted Mr. Tylor's views and had done so without acknowledgment, Spencer sent the editor a few pages for the next number, showing that he had not adopted Mr. Tylor's opinions. The correspondence with Professor Croom Robertson, the editor, continued till about the middle of June,[1] Spencer's replies being sent to Mr. Tylor before publication, and Mr. Tylor's to Spencer. In June Spencer writes: "My reply to Mr. Tylor, . . . while I think it completely rebuts his charges, establishes more clearly than before my own independence, and brings out with increased distinctness the inconsistencies in Mr. Tylor's statements of his own views." When forwarding this to Mr. Tylor, the editor expressed the opinion that Spencer "does in his second rejoinder establish his independence, and I shall be very glad if the controversy can be dropped." To the same effect a few days later: "You will let me repeat my opinion that in the statement Spencer establishes his independence, and I confess I shall be somewhat surprised if you can bring decisive evidence to the contrary. If you cannot, I am still of the same

[1] *Mind* for July, pp. 415-29.

opinion I before expressed that you can, when there is no question as to your independence, well afford to make a frank allowance of his.'' Apparently this was what Mr. Tylor did not see his way to. '' My belief,'' he wrote, '' is strengthened the more I examine Spencer's writings, that his memory quite misleads him about where he gets his ideas.''

The additional chapters of the first volume of the *Sociology* being off his mind only a short time before the end of May, it was a question how to spend to best advantage the weeks intervening between then and his annual holiday. Having as yet made no plans, a letter from Mrs. Smith inviting him to Ardtornish was welcomed. His stay there from the middle of August to the middle of September fully realised his expectations as to enjoyment and health.

To Mrs. Smith.

London, 17 *September*, 1877.

I may say that I think I am stronger than I have been since this time last year. Thanks in great measure, and I think chiefly, to Ardtornish and all its pleasures, indoor and outdoor, for this. Again I have to thank you for many happy days in addition to those enjoyed in years gone by. Should any one hereafter use the materials of a biographical kind which will be left behind me, he will probably find clear enough evidence that the most of the happiest days of my life have been spent at Ardtornish. And not only in respect of pleasure and health, but, as a consequence, in respect of working power, I feel my indebtedness. As with parents it ultimately becomes the chief object of life to rear their children and put them forward prosperously in the world, so, as an author's life advances, the almost exclusive

object of anxiety becomes the fulfilment of his literary aims—the rearing of the progeny of the brain.

The needful data for "Political Institutions" not being yet ready for use, he made up his mind to take up the division dealing with "Ceremonial," publishing the successive chapters in the *Fortnightly Review*. By the end of the year arrangements were being made for their simultaneous appearance in the United States, France, Germany, Italy, Russia and Hungary. When 1877 closed, everything seemed favourable for uninterrupted progress.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SECULARIZATION OF MORALS

(*January*, 1878—*October*, 1879)

With the new year he made another attempt to keep a diary. The entry on January 1, 1878, runs: "'Presents.' Business. Club. Dined at Huxley's: Morley, Waller, Mr. Smalley." The entry "Presents," referring to the chapter so headed in "Ceremonial Government," occurs for the first eight days, except the 5th and 6th, when he was revising. Ninth—"Unwell—in bed all morning. Dictated introduction to 'Consciousness under Chloroform,' and memo. for Principles of Morality." Ethics was entered upon just now in the fear, as stated in the *Autobiography* (ii., 382), that he might never reach it in the ordinary course.

On the 13th began what he describes as "about the most miserable time that I can recall in my experience."

13th.—Wretched night—pain and no sleep. Indoors all day after getting up at 1. Rather better in evening. Mr. Bruce came in the morning and prescribed. 14th.—Wretched night. No sleep, but less pain. Indoors all day. No appetite. Sciatica, &c., pretty well gone. 15th.—Another dreadful night. Only sleep was while sitting in a chair by the fire in the middle of the night. 16th.—Wretched night. Took chloral. Very weak. In bed all day. No sleep. Little better appetite. 17th.—Hor-

Note.—*Autobiography*, ii., chaps. liv., lv., lvi.

rible night again. Better, however. Down room after breakfast. Revised some proofs by hearing them read. Walshe came to consult. Appetite better. Lord A. Russell called. 18th.—Bad night again after taking quinine. Revising proofs by hearing read. A little appetite. Temperature still too high. 19th.—Another wretched night. Finished proofs. Walshe came again. Gave up quinine and prescribed bromide of potassium. Lewes called. 20th.—Better night. A little work—revising. Lewes called to see me. Temperature still too high. 21st.—Still better night. Revising. Sent proofs of Chapter III. to translators. Lewes and Mrs. Lewes called and spent an hour. Temperature lowering. 22nd. —Very good night. Improved generally. Letters and dictating Autobiography. Temperature lowering. 23rd. —Night not so good. Temperature nearly normal. Appetite fair. At 4.30 left Victoria—Brighton at 5.30. Reached Bristol Hotel without damage. Slept fairly by aid of chloric ether.

He remained at Brighton for over a week, improving daily. On return he plunged at once into social engagements. The social distraction cure had long been a favourite remedy, and he seemed bent on now giving it a fair trial. In the diary for March one reads: "Called on Mr. Gladstone, Sir H. Thompson and Mrs. Smith." "Fancy ball at the Huths. Went in plain dress to look on." "Gaiety Theatre." "Globe Theatre." "X dinner." "Exhibition of Old Paintings at Royal Academy." Another visit to Brighton. A "Paper by Bell at Anthropological on the Gesture-Language of Deaf Mutes." "Dined with Debus at the Saville Club." "Went to Hemming's for billiards." "Afternoon concert . . . pupils of Blind School." It was the same during April. One day he lunched with the Leweses,

afterwards going with them to Herschel's concert; another day he dined at A. Sellar's, where he met Mr. Grant Duff, Smalley, and T. Sellar. On the 12th he wrote a letter to Mr. Froude for *Edinburgh Review* about copyright. On the 16th he gave a dinner at the Club to "F. Harrison, Morley, Pelly, Busk, Debus, Rutson and Frankland." Two days after he went to Standish, where he stayed a week, unwell most of the time. To the Adelphi Theatre on his birthday; to the wedding breakfast of Professor Huxley's eldest daughter on 4th May. Took Mr. Lott to the Royal Academy on 17th; and on evening of same day "dined at Spottiswoode's and went with them to the R.I. to hear Graham Bell." Next day he was off to Paris with Mr. Lott, taking with him a little work to revise. On the 24th called on Baillière, the publisher. Next day "Dined chez Brébant with a party of 16 professors, journalists and deputies, invited by Baillière to meet me." Replying to the toast of his health he proposed "The Fraternity of the two nations," commenting on the great importance of cordial relations between France and England.

By the month of June he had come to the conclusion that the interest shown in the articles on "Ceremonial Government" was not sufficient to justify their continuance in the *Fortnightly*. The concluding chapter was begun, but put aside in favour of the "Data of Ethics," several chapters of which were now rough sketched in Kensington Gardens. Of this he writes to Dr. Youmans (5 July):—

I am quite satisfied with the working out of it; and when issued it will be a good piece of work done, and

will, moreover, I think, be useful for the cause at large, as showing its moral bearings, and as disposing pretty effectually of all those reprobatory views which the theological party continually utter. I hope to begin writing it soon after my return to town in the autumn.

The following are further extracts from the diary:—

2*nd July*.—Italian Ambassador called to say that the Roman Academy had elected me a member. 5th.—To Kew to Hooker's garden party. Dined with Potters to meet Prof. Marsh. 6th.—Gave picnic at St. George's Hill, Weybridge, to four Potters, two Busks, two Harrisons, two Crosses, Lewes, Prof. Marsh. Tea at Oatlands. Went off very well. 14th.—Called to enquire of Mrs. Smith—not likely to live through the day. 16th.—Dined with Sir H. Thompson: Huxley, Trollope, Lord A. Russell, Prinsep, Knowles, Marks, &c.

The death of Mrs. Smith must have brought vividly to his mind the shock he had experienced in 1871, when her husband passed away. "The consciousness," he then wrote to Mr. Valentine Smith, "that the friendly grasp of his hand is one that I shall never again feel, already makes, and will continue to make, an appreciable difference in my world of thought."[1]

To W. Valentine Smith.

18 *July*, 1878.

I sympathise deeply in your feelings and in those of the family at large, and I enter the more into your griefs, as Mrs. Smith's death is a grief to me also. By her countless kindnesses, she is associated in my thoughts with my happiest days; and the world is the poorer to me, now that she has passed away from it.

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 268

As you well know, I am not given to exaggerations; so that I may be understood literally when I say that in all my experience I have known no one so sweet-natured, and in all ways so admirable, as your mother. There would be something like a justification for the Comtist religion—" the worship of Humanity "—if there were much humanity like hers.

Leaving town in the last week of July he spent a few days in Liverpool with Mr. and Mrs. Holt, and then went to Inveroran. The weather being too dry for fishing, the first eleven days of August were spent in rambling, revising, and reading Bain's *Mental and Moral Science*. Note the boyish satisfaction implied in the concluding remark in the diary for each of the next three days:—

12th.—Fishing. River up. Got two salmon: one of 20 lbs. weight, one of 12 lbs. Three other fishermen caught nothing. 13th.—Fishing. A flood. One grilse of 5 lbs. Three other fishermen caught nothing. 14th.—Fishing. No sport. Three other fishermen caught nothing. 17th.—Reading and revising in the morning. Afternoon at 3.30 began fishing. Lost four salmon in succession.

He was back in London on the 23rd, at least two weeks earlier than he intended. " My holiday has not been a success," he writes to Dr. Youmans from Carlisle on his way south, sending him also the paper on " Consciousness under Chloroform," being the experiences of a university graduate under chloroform, to which Spencer began dictating on 9th January what he calls an introduction, but which was really an appendix or summing up, showing how those experiences " furnished re-

markable verification of certain doctrines set forth in the *Principles of Psychology.*"[1]

On the 3rd September he wrote to Professor Tyndall, who was in Switzerland: "I send you from to-day's *Times* a leading article containing a passage which concerns you and which, being considerably to your disadvantage, alike as a man of science and as a logician, I think you ought to rectify." Taking as its text an address by Virchow on the necessity of caution in receiving and still more in teaching to the young some of the doctrines of modern science, the *Times* maintained that such problems should be reserved for one who will "devote himself to research in silence." Professor Tyndall does not appear to have responded to Spencer's suggestion; but the article led to letters in the *Times* from Prof. Ray Lankester and Mr. Richard Proctor.

While engaged in putting the rough sketch of the "Data of Ethics" into shape, he had been trying to persuade Dr. Youmans to join him in a proposed sojourn in the south of France.

To E. L. Youmans.

27 *September,* 1878.

I intend to take with me a good quantity of MS. to occupy me in revision. . . . If you could make up your mind to come with me and do a little idling in pleasant places, I am convinced that you will find it in the long run a great economy of time. As to not seeing how such things are possible, I hold it to be an instance of the absurd fanaticism of men like yourself, who think that the one thing impossible is to let business go, and

[1] *Mind* for October, 1878. Also *Popular Science Monthly* for October. *Principles of Psychology,* i., 636.

that the only thing possible is to sacrifice health and life to it.

30 *October*.—My going abroad will very much be determined by your answer. . . . For once in your life resolve to take a little leisure and relaxation. You have not so very great a length of life left that you can with wisdom put it off. You should remember that you have not only got to do your work, but you have got to live; and, ever since I have known you, you have been thinking only of the work and never of the living. . . . I hope you will be able to arrange for your sister to come with you.

A few weeks before starting for the south of France, he had to mourn the loss of his oldest intimate literary friend—Mr. G. H. Lewes—to whose burial he went on December 4th. This (like the funeral of Mr. Octavius Smith in 1871) was one of the few instances in which he made an exception to his usual practice of avoiding funerals.[1]

Spencer and Dr. Youmans left London a few days before Christmas. Their time on the Riviera was divided between Hyères, Cannes, Nice, Cimiez, and Mentone. Mentone "is a charming place, far preferable to any of the others along the Riviera. . . . The multiplicity of beautiful walks is almost incomprehensible—how so much can be put in so small a space. The place, however, like nearly all the others in that region (I except Cimiez), is decidedly relaxing." From Mentone excursions were made to Ventimiglia, Bordighera, San Remo, Monaco and Monte Carlo. Here are some of the entries from the diary:—

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 374.

9 *January,* 1879.—Rained at night and all day. Very cold—could not keep warm with fire in room night and day. Revising. Indoors all day. One day.—Excursion up one of the valleys, Youmans on an ass, I walking. Next day.—Long walk with Oscar Browning and Youmans. Another day.—Wet night and rainy day. A good deal of revising, very little walking. Returned Lord Acton's call. Feb. 11th.—Finished all my revising. 14th.—Wet morning. Reading Sidgwick. Found that Lord Acton had called with Sig. Minghetti. Returned Sig. Minghetti's call—out. 15th.—Went to station 10.40. Lord Acton brought Sig. Minghetti and M. Lavallie to the station to introduce, just before I started. Left at 11. Dined at Marseilles about six. Travelled in the Wagon-lit. Got very little sleep. 16th.—Reached Paris at 10, not much the worse. . . . Youmans exhausted. 17th.—Called on Baillière and arranged about the translation of *Ethics* and retranslation of *Education.* Left Paris at 1.20. Got home at 11.30.[1]

Hitherto he had escaped the attentions of *Vanity Fair,* but on 30 April he wrote: " You will laugh at *Vanity Fair* which I send you, and in which I am gibbeted this week. The biographical sketch is about as absurd as the portrait."

While correcting proofs of the last chapters of the " Data of Ethics " he spent a few days at Wilton. The diary runs:—

9th *June.*—Got to Wilton at 5. Cordially received by Lord and Lady Pembroke. Guests: Hon. S. Littleton, Mr. Wheatley. 10th.—Revising proofs. Walking. Afternoon played lawn tennis. Drove with Lady Pembroke

[1] For an account of the journey to and sojourn in the south of France from his companion's point of view, the reader is referred to Dr. Youmans's racy letters to members of his family, printed in *Edward Livingston Youmans,* pp. 350-61.

and her sister. Lord and Lady Vesey arrived, and Mr. Val Prinsep. 11th.—Bad morning: lounged and talked. Afternoon took a long walk alone to escape talking. Lady Lothian, sister of Lady Pembroke, arrived—a disciple of mine. 12th.—Bad day. Lounging and talking. Afternoon walked and played lawn tennis. Mr. and Lady Constance Lawley, a disciple of mine, came.

To E. L. Youmans.

20 *June*, 1879.

The " Data of Ethics " was issued on Tuesday. . . .

If you could cultivate a more " devil-may-care " attitude of mind, it would be a very good thing for you, and would eventually conduce to doing a great deal more. Now that I am not with you and cannot play the bully over you daily, I see you are relapsing into your old malpractices. . . . However, it is no use saying anything.

Dr. Youmans intended to write an introduction to the American edition of the " Data of Ethics," so as to " give a pretext to copyrighting it, and at all events mark it as a kind of authorized edition that could not be fully reproduced. . . . I have worked upon the matter, though the result will not answer." The proposed introduction was afterwards amplified and altered, and appeared as an article in the *North American Review* for August. At home the book was welcomed with many private expressions of approval.

From William E. H. Lecky.

20 *June*, 1879.

I am glad to gather from your prospectus that you mean in the ensuing parts to deal with the different groups or classes of virtues separately, describing, no

doubt, their genesis, their relations to one another, their limitations and their proportionate value. Most books on moral philosophy seem to me almost worthless because they do not deal sufficiently in the concrete, do not divide or distinguish the different kinds of moral action and show how frequently they conflict with one another, and how trains of circumstances which foster one class of virtues will often inevitably depress another. . . . I think a great deal has still to be written on the filiation of moral qualities, on the history of moral types—the proportionate value which different qualities bear in the ideals of different ages.

From Mrs. Lewes.

27 *June*, 1879.

I rejoice not in the cause, but in the fact of your having broken the contemplated order of your series for the sake of securing this portion of your Ethics, and if I did not believe it to be an impertinence to tell an author what one would wish him to do, I should say a little more of the value that many would attach to a continuation of this weft as something more needed than even the completion of the Sociological portion. Of course, as you predict, you will be partly misunderstood and misrepresented. That is destiny unshunnable. All one must care about is that some grains of corrective knowledge or useful stimulus will be here and there swallowed and digested.

I have an evil pleasure in observing that you have as good a crop of little misprints as I should have left myself.

From the Earl of Derby.

30 *June*, 1879.

Lord Derby is glad to have the opportunity . . . of expressing to Mr. Spencer personally his sense of the intellectual obligation under which he lies to a writer

whose thoughts he has for many years endeavoured to understand and follow. It is neither his wish nor his right to pay compliments; but he may be allowed to acknowledge a debt.

From Alfred R. Wallace.

2 *July*, 1879.

I must express my admiration of the complete way in which you have developed the *true nature* of Ethics. On that aspect of the question I agree with you unhesitatingly throughout. . . . But I *doubt* if evolution alone, even as you have exhibited its action, can account for the development of the advanced and enthusiastic *altruism* that not only exists now, but apparently has always existed among men. . . . If on this point I doubt, on another point I feel certain, and that is, not even your beautiful system of ethical science can act as a "controlling agency" or in any way "fill up the gap left by the disappearance of the code of supernatural ethics."

French appreciation of Spencer's writings did not always take a form so agreeable as that described in the *Autobiography* (ii., 383). A reactionary member of the Chamber of Deputies had invoked Spencer's opinion against one of the two "Lois Ferry"—the one excluding from the superior council of public instruction the representatives of the clergy. Spencer mentions this in a letter to Dr. Youmans (July 26).

If you happen to see the *Times* of the 24th (I think it was) you will see, in the letter of the Paris correspondent, indication of the fact that, in the Chamber of Deputies, the clerical party have been trying to support their views by quotations from one of my books, and that I have had to write to Alglave a letter, which he has published [*Revue Scientifique* for July], correct-

ing their misapprehension. The *Times* correspondent rightly remarks, however, that I am clearly opposed to that part of the "Ferry" bill which negatives private initiation of teaching.

During August and the greater part of September he was on holiday—at Inveroran, Ardtornish, Laidlawstiel, and Russland. At Laidlawstiel he had a great deal of discussion. "As both Lord and Lady Reay are very stimulating companions I did an amount of talk which over-tired my brain."

To Miss Flora Smith.

Laidlawstiel, 9 *September*, 1879.

There had been a great clearance here the day before my arrival—chiefly of French friends; and there remained only Mr. Rollo Russell, the second of the late Earl's sons. On Sunday two local notabilities came—two of the Cecils, Lord Arthur and Lord Lionel—who have taken to sheep-farming; one of them having married the daughter of a Northumberland farmer under whom they studied farming. They are very pleasant and intelligent, and surrender themselves completely to their careers. Since their departure yesterday, I have been the sole guest, and have had a dreadful amount of talking to do. . . .

And now let me say how much I have enjoyed my stay at Ardtornish—more happy days added to the countless happy days of past years. When I look back on my life, I feel that the part of it which I would willingly live over again, is the part made up of my many visits to your Highland home.

Pray accept, and give to your brother, my thanks for unceasing kind attentions.

On his return to town what remained of September and the whole of October were occupied mainly with

giving the final touches to " Ceremonial Institutions " (the name he had substituted for " Ceremonial Government "), in arranging his memoranda for the next division of the *Sociology,* and in writing the first chapter of " Political Institutions."

To E. L. Youmans.

1 *October,* 1879.

I have already seen the *Nation's* review [of the " Data of Ethics."] . . . It is not much amiss save in being rather too jaunty in its style.

The other reviews have been quite satisfactory—the one in the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the one in the *Academy* being, like that in the *Athenæum,* careful analyses. I feel alike surprised and gratified at this new turn reviewers are taking, in occupying the space not so much in giving their own opinions as in giving the author's. Bain's review in *Mind* is just issued, and is extremely satisfactory. It, too, is essentially analytical, with a small amount of criticism expressing no dissent of an important kind; and, coming as it does from an adherent of the old utilitarian view, and from one who has familiarised himself so completely with the whole field of Ethics, with all its controversies, it is entirely what I could wish. He really, I think, behaves very well considering that I have on so many occasions been rather unsparing in my criticisms of him.

6 *October.*—I have just received a volume attacking me, entitled " On Mr. Spencer's Formula of Evolution." You may judge the character of it from my acknowledgment sent to the author, which was as follows:—" Mr. Spencer is obliged to Mr. Guthrie for the copy of his work. Mr. Spencer is not obliged to Mr. Guthrie for his elaborate misrepresentations."

8 *October.*—Your letter of the 26th has just reached me, and in the course of two or three hours afterwards,

the copy of the *North American Review*. Many thanks for both. I am glad you have made use of the notice which you proposed to affix to the American edition of the "Data of Ethics." On the whole it is more appropriate, and will be of much greater service, where it is.

It is capitally done, I think, . . . The taking as a text of the initial sentence of the "Data of Ethics"—the relations between the part and the whole—is very happy, and is especially true in its relation to the Synthetic Philosophy. I was glad also that you dwelt upon the great perversion of opinion that has resulted from the strange, almost universal, tendency to take the negative part of *First Principles* as the characteristic part; ignoring the positive essential part constituting the theory of evolution. It is a wonderful illustration of human perversity. One never gets over the tendency to suppose that if things were clearly put before the people, they will somehow or other see them; but one ever gets repeated proofs that no matter how conclusive the demonstration, no matter how abundant the illustrations, they will persist in some absurd misapprehension or other.[1]

10 *October*.—I enclose you something to astonish you. Imagine my name being received with cheers at a Church Congress! After such a sign of the times as this, what may we not expect? The fact may serve you upon occasion to throw at the heads of your theologians in the United States.

The enclosure was a report, in the *Times* of October 10, of a meeting of the Church Congress at Swansea, at

[1] About this constant complaint of misunderstanding or misrepresentation a critic remarked: "Whether that is a just reproach to his critics or to himself, as being the author of a system so liable to be misunderstood, may well be considered."

which a paper was read on "Religion Benefits from Recent Science and Research." In the discussion that followed, the Rev. Professor Watkins, of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, speaking of the Evolution theory, said that "he felt sure that when the history of this century came to be written from the standpoint of the future, the name of Herbert Spencer would be found in the very first rank among English speakers and thinkers (Cheers). In ultimate principles he differed from Spencer *toto cœlo,* but he was therefore the more anxious to acknowledge the greatness of his work and the philosophical spirit in which it had been conducted." Another clergyman of the Church of England—the Principal of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead, sent him an Inaugural Address. "It will show you how greatly I value your works on Evolution and how deeply I am indebted to you in my studies on sociological subjects. . . . I am not a solitary instance of belief in Evolution among my *confrères* in the ministry." From Nonconformists came similar proofs of an open-mindedness, the absence of which among the clergy Spencer was too ready to assume.

From E. L. Youmans.

29 *October,* 1879.

Thanks for the slip from the *Times* which did astonish me. There was an American Church Congress in session in Albany, and Appleton's country parson, Mr. Wylde, was secretary of it. Mr. W. H. Appleton posted the slip to him as soon as it came, and it was passed around and produced a great deal of gratification. Rev. Mr. Wylde said on his return, "We are coming over to you just as fast as we can get there."

What you said about the anti-military movement [1] interested me much. I have thought a good deal about it. But will it really be worth while for you to move in the matter? Will not the burden of such a thing fall very much on yourself, and have you an ounce to spare from your legitimate work, which in the long run must tell more widely and powerfully upon public sentiment than any organised agitation could do.

[1] In a postscript to letter of October 10, quoted in *Autobiography*, ii., 387-388.

CHAPTER XVI

EGYPT AND AMERICA

(*November*, 1879—*December*, 1882)

HITHERTO Spencer's farthest journeys abroad had been the visits to Italy in 1868, and to the south of France in 1878. His friends in the United States had for years been pressing him to come to America, but, while continuing to treat it as a probable event, he had from time to time put it off on one pretext or another. And now, towards the end of 1879, he suddenly made up his mind to go—not to America, but to Egypt. This step would, he felt sure, astonish his friend in New York.

To E. L. YOUMANS.

5 *November*, 1879.

You will be startled by the intelligence that in a few days hence I start for Egypt—having agreed to join a party up the Nile. The intention is to be away for four months; so that it will probably be the beginning of March before I come back. I hesitated some days because, not being able to take an amanuensis, my work will be retarded; for I have no MS. ready for revision as I had last winter. However, I have decided that I must revert to primitive practices and be my own amanuensis while on the Nile; where, as I hear, there is plenty of leisure.

NOTE.—*Autobiography*, ii., chaps. liii., liv., lv., lvi., lvii., lviii.

The volume of "Ceremonial Institutions" will be out of my hands before I go next Tuesday.

P.S.—I enclose you an inaugural address of Calderwood, Professor of Moral Philosophy at Edinburgh. It is a piece of poor fumbling. But it is a good sign of the times.

The following are extracts from the diary:—

30th October.—Went to see Kate Potter about going to Egypt. 31st.—Decided to go to Egypt. *6th November.*—Letter from Mrs. Potter proposing that Margaret should go with me to Egypt. . . . Called on W. Cripps (Margaret's brother-in-law) to see whether he thought Mrs. Grundy would frown. He pooh-poohed my qualms. 9th.—Finished revising proofs of "Ceremonial Institutions." George Holme and his son Charles called and lunched with me. . . . Went to say good-bye to Huxley, Mrs. Lewes, Busks. . . . Called at Meinertzhagens. 10th.—Final preparations. Seeing last revise. 14th.—Got to Bologna. 15th.—Started at 9 sight-seeing. Saw San Petronio and San Dominico; the University and the gallery des Beaux Arts. 16th, Sunday.—Went up the great tower of Bologna. Saw more churches. 20th.—Arrived at Alexandria. Took guide and went with Margaret round bazaar. Saw the remaining obelisk cased for journey to America. 21st.—Arrived at Cairo. After déjeuner saw howling dervish worship. Saw mosques of Sultan Hassan and Muhammad Ali. Tomb of kings and cemetery. 26th.—Started with party to the Pyramids. Did not ascend, but perambulated all of them. Examined various tombs. Much impressed. Day to be remembered. 27th.—Arranging memo. for chapter on "Political Organisation." In afternoon walked with Mr. Barnett to old Cairo. Back on donkeys. 28th.—Went to dancing dervishes and to ancient mosque salon. 29th.—Went with our party to decide on boat. Fixed on the "Hedwig." 30th.—Saw two mosques by permission; also Arab University (!) and bazaars. 1*st December.*—

Moonlight ride with party on donkeys to see the tombs of the caliphs. [Mariette Bey was read and re-read during a visit to Helouan from the 5th to the 9th.] 6th.—Wandered over adjacent desert. . . . Struck by marks of denundation. Recent storms and great torrents. 12th.—Started about 11. 13th.—Saw the step-pyramid, the tomb of Tih and the Serapeum. 22nd.—Beni-Hassan. *Ice on deck at night.* 23rd.—Good sailing day. Reached Assiout at about 4 in the morning. Sailing all night that I might catch the train and return. 24th.—Bade good-bye to Barnetts and Potters and left at 8 for Cairo. At 10.15 three carriages thrown off the rails by a buffalo. Started again at 12.15. [This sudden resolve to return home, of which no mention is made in the *Autobiography,* was due to his having fallen into a state of health such as that described in the *Autobiography,* " in which fancies, afterwards seen to be morbid, took possession of me." After seeing Dr. Grant and two days' rest at Cairo, the morbid fancies vanished.] Decided to rejoin my friends. 28th.—Started at 8. Got to Assiout at 7. Mr. Miles gone. Taken on board the " Vision " by Mr. Darrell. 29th.—Telegraphed to Mr. Barnett that I am coming. Blew a gale, could not leave our moorings. [Left on 30th, doing forty miles that day, and twenty the last day of the year. In the diary for 1880, across the first five days one reads:] Not having my new diary with me, could not fill up these days, during which I was travelling on towards Luxor with Mr. Darrell and Mr. Wroughton. *6th January.*—Arrived at Luxor at 2 o'clock. Got on board the " Hedwig." Friends absent. Went to the temple of Karnak and spent the afternoon there. 8th.—Saw the temple of Esneh. 9th.—Saw the temple of Edfou. 11th.—Assouan. Went to see the semi-detached obelisk. 13th.—Got to Philæ. Scenery around very fine. Interesting day. 14th.—Spent day at Philæ and adjacent shores. Disappointed with remains, but not with the scenery. 16th.—Excursion to

Assouan and island of Elephantine. None but small donkeys which I would not ride, disliking to overtax them. Walked through desert both ways. 17th.—Friends started for second cataract and I went on board Cook's steamer. Found there Professor Sayce. 20th.—Across desert to Assouan, partly riding, partly walking. 21st.—To Luxor. Went to see Karnak by moonlight. 23rd.—Excursion to Abydos, very instructive, with Professor Sayce as cicerone. [On the 25th he was at Cairo, where he stayed till 28th, when he went to Alexandria, embarking on 29th for Venice, which was reached on 4th February.] 5th.—Along various small canals, and saw sundry churches and the Accademia. Up the Campanile of St. Mark, and gondola round the Giudecca in afternoon. 6th.—Saw Chiesa della Salute, St. Giorgio Maggiore, the Arsenal, the north shore of Venice, the Doges' Palace, and into St. Mark again. 7th.—Got to Milan. Glanced into Duomo and walked about admiring the town. 8th, Sunday.—Heard part of mass in Cathedral. Gallery of the Brera. Explored town. Evening at La Scala. 9th.—Went to the gallery of paintings at the Brera. Went again to admire the cathedral. 10th.—Reached Paris. 11th.—Called on Baillière, saw Ribot and Marion. 12th.—Got to London. Heartily glad—more pleasure than in anything that occurred during my tour.

His experiences he thus sums up: "At my age I feel more and more that the game is not worth the candle." "However, I have gathered some valuable information and gained some valuable impressions." One of these impressions he describes with genuine and deep feeling in the *Autobiography* (ii., 402). The materials he had taken with him, intending to write some chapters of "Political Institutions" on the Nile, were brought back unused. He was therefore anxious to go on with this

at once, but hesitated in view of the need for adding to the *Psychology* a new Part—on "Congruities."

To E. L. Youmans.

23 *February*, 1880.

While I have been away in Egypt my affairs have been going on swimmingly. . . .

I am just now in an undecided state whether forthwith to go on with "Political Institutions," or whether to add a new division to the *Principles of Psychology*. . . .[1] Possibly I may first write some two or three chapters of "Political Institutions" which I have pretty well thought out, and which may suffer by delay, and then turn to this addition to *Psychology*.

Dr. Youmans was decidedly of opinion that the *Psychology* should be attended to first. "The repetition and concert of attack at this point with no reply are construed as a victory of criticism. So that just now it seems more important to strengthen the discussion than extend it. A reply at this time, and bringing out the congruities you originally thought of, would be very telling." This advice was not followed, probably for the reason given above that his mind was already occupied by the ideas to be set forth in "Political Institutions," the earlier chapters of which were written during the excitement of a general election.

To Edward Lott.

8 *April*, 1880.

Let us shake hands over this immense political change. I expect you are even more surprised than I have been, judging from the discouragement you were under when

[1] For the omitted portion of the letter see *Autobiography*, ii., 416.

you were with me. I suspect we have none of us sufficiently appreciated the great effect of late years produced in divorcing provincial opinion from London opinion by the growth of the provincial daily press. The result of this has been that whereas in past times the provincial towns took their tone from London daily papers, now they in large measure take their tone from their own daily papers.

The chapters he was writing and the political situation were probably responsible for his again raising the question of the feeling towards America at the time of the Civil War.[1] Dr. Youmans would fain have shelved the matter altogether, but, fearing that Spencer would not agree to that, he pleaded for postponement. "There would certainly be less objection to its publication now than formerly. But there are special reasons why it should not appear now. The public are occupied with you now in another relation, and it would be inexpedient to divide, or divert, attention. I send you some papers illustrative of the row at Yale College." The "row" had arisen out of the use of the *Study of Sociology* as a textbook by Professor Sumner; President Porter objecting to the use, in a college "intimately associated in its history and constitution with the Christian religion," of a book the tone of which was calculated to diminish respect for Christianity. When the excitement had died down, the letter was sent to Dr. Youmans "with the commission to give the *Tribune* the alternative of either publishing it entire or not at all." It appeared in full in the *Tribune* of June 28, 1880, accompanied by a dissident leading article, in which it was said:—

[1] *Supra*, chap. xii., p. 191.

"Any letter which Mr. Herbert Spencer addresses to the American people will be read with respect and interest. . . . There is less misconception of the facts, on this side of the water, than Mr. Spencer imagines. . . . Mr. Spencer's citations refer to a time so long before the actual outbreak of war that they cannot be considered of great value. Perhaps we can best learn the state of English sentiment in 1861 by consulting an English statesman who knows his countrymen much better than we do, and better than even Mr. Herbert Spencer." Quoting from Mr. Bright's speeches the *Tribune* goes on to say: "It is interesting to remark how differently the hasty recognition of confederate belligerency struck Mr. Spencer and Mr. Bright. . . . If Americans were becoming irritable toward Great Britain, Mr. Bright could not help admitting that many things had been said and done in England to justify the feeling—even to make England cordially hated. That is now a thing of the past; but if our English friends will discuss it they must hear the truth."

Of the reception of the letter Dr. Youmans writes (3 July):—

It does not seem to have made any public impression. . . . I have seen several of your old and staunch friends, who expressed emphatic regret at its appearance, the strain of comment being as follows: "The first weak thing with which Spencer's name has publicly been associated"; and "So Spencer is beaten for the first time"; "A bad introduction for Spencer's forthcoming Political Discussion"; "Happily it has fallen so dead it cannot do much mischief." I have simply replied that it was an honest piece of work that Spencer thought important and wished published, and it is therefore best that it should be printed. He will care little how it is received.

As for Anglo-American copyright, it was becoming a crying necessity.

To E. L. Youmans.

27 *April,* 1880.

I regret that the copyright question stands in so little hopeful a position; for I quite agree with you that in the absence of popular opinion in favour of a change, there is little chance of making an effectual one. I regret to hear that Matthew Arnold's absurd article is doing mischief with you. It did not occur to me that any one would pay much attention to it. I will glance at it and see whether it may not be effectually dealt with in a short space, and may, in such case, possibly say something about it.

6 *October.*—Knowles tells me that your representative over here, Lowell, has drawn up a form of treaty, the basis of which is giving copyright to authors if the works are reproduced in the United States—such reproduction allowing of the transmission of stereotype plates. This seems to be all that is wanted, if the details are not such as to hinder the working of it.

In July, 1881, Dr. Youmans was hopeful of the result; but after a visit to Washington in December, along with Mr. Appleton and Mr. Harper, he wrote in a tone of deep despondency. The visit "amounted to nothing, and I was fairly ashamed of the whole transaction."

To E. L. Youmans.

10 *January,* 1882.

Your accounts of copyright negociations and of the condition of the publishing business are certainly very unsatisfactory. . . .

I wish your American public could be made to feel

the utter viciousness of the plea commonly put in in defence of your piratical system—that it is essential for your institutions that the people should have access to knowledge, unrestrained by regard for the author's claims. The truth which, instead of this, should be impressed upon them, but which I fear nothing will make them recognise, is that free institutions can exist and work well only in virtue of an all-pervading equity. The coercive form of government, itself implying an over-riding of men's rights, is capable of maintaining a tolerably stable social state among citizens whose regard for one another's rights is comparatively small: force does what conscience fails to do. But in proportion as a government becomes non-coercive, and is the concomitant of a social system based upon contract and the working together under voluntary co-operation, things can go well only in proportion as citizens have such natures as prompt them to respect one another's claims.

Already the well-working of your institutions is perturbed in all kinds of ways by dishonesty. Any increase of dishonesty will eventually, in some way or other, cause their collapse; their only salvation is increase of honesty. Hence, so far from its being needful, as your people allege, that the necessity is diffusion of knowledge at the expense even of honesty, it is, contrariwise, needful that there should be a diffusion of honesty, even should there be some consequent impediment to the spread of knowledge. It is, I suppose, hopeless to try to make them see this.

To return to the spring and early summer of 1880. Mention is made in the diary of meeting M. Renan and Mr. Robert Browning at dinner at Mrs. Lecky's; of being at Professor Huxley's lecture on " The Coming of Age of the *Origin of Species*"; of meeting M. Vámbéry at Mrs. Huxley's, and Mr. Gladstone and a " distinguished

party " at Lady Reay's. Of work on which he was engaged he mentions a reply to Mr. Guthrie, a postscript to the *Study of Sociology* [1] and a preface and appendix to the fourth edition of *First Principles*. He was also in correspondence with Mr. William De Morgan, who was annoyed that in the *Study of Sociology* his father had been charged with " recklessness of misrepresentation." To avoid giving offence Spencer offered to modify the passage in the International Scientific Series edition and to suppress it in the library edition. Mr. De Morgan preferred, however, that the passage should be left as it was, Spencer adding his reasons for the charge.[2]

To E. L. Youmans.

8 *July*, 1880.

Grant Allen is busy with the article " The Ways of Orthodox Critics." The materials for it, which I have furnished for him, are abundantly strong, and will, if rightly put together, form a very telling response to their attacks. . . . I shall probably send you, in a few days, proof of a portion of the Appendix to *First Principles*, in which I am making a rejoinder to Tait and Kirkman in respect to a criticism on the formula of Evolution. It will, I think, prove somewhat amusing.

Yesterday, in pursuance of an appointment made with him, I had an interview with Lord Derby for the purpose of enlisting his sympathies in favour of a professorship of Sociology which I want to get established at Liverpool. They are about to form at Liverpool a college, and have raised some £70,000. Lord Derby has subscribed £10,000 to found one of the chairs, and until I saw him I was unaware that he had decided what the

[1] Library edition, p. 369.

[2] *Study of Sociology* (I.S.S. edition, p. 412; library edition, p. 394).

professorship should be. It seems, however, that he has settled that it is to have a chair for Natural History, so that my hope that he would at my instigation establish a chair of Sociology is balked. . . .

Just now I am writing the additional part of the *Psychology,* promised some years ago under the title "Congruities," and hope I may get through it before I leave town. So long a time has passed since the subject was out of my hands that I feel somewhat slow in my thought on returning to it, and am perplexed how to present the leading facts in adequately small compass, and at the same time in a sufficiently clear way.

16 *July.*—I received a day or two ago a work on Protection and Free Trade from a Spaniard at Barcelona, in which he lays my various books under contribution, and especially the general ideas of the social organism, by way of supporting the protectionists' doctrine! . . .

A curious incident, and one of considerable importance to me, occurred a few days ago. You remember my old antagonist, Moulton, and our tremendous fight. I do not know if I ever told you that not long after, he made, as I perceived by the signs, various endeavours to establish friendly relations, and after a time, by force of getting to meet me at dinner parties, succeeded in doing so, and ever since then he has been very civil.

The "curious incident" had reference to information from Mr. Moulton bearing on the Nebular Hypothesis.[1]

Reports even more absurd than usual were going the round of the Press, both at home and in America. One was to the effect that he was about to marry an American heiress, whom he was said to have met at Cairo. Another that he was about to "make the tour of the world

[1] *Infra,* chap. xxvi.

by the United States and Japan route. He will devote two years to it, take ' sociological observations ' at the more important points, and be accompanied by one or two scientific friends and one of his secretaries."

To E. L. Youmans.

8 *September*, 1880.

How the false statement has originated I have not the remotest idea. Commonly, for these gossiping paragraphs, absurd as they mostly are, I can discern some origin; but in this case I know of none whatever. Nothing that I have said or done, so far as I know, gives the slightest foundation for the statement. . . .

I had a call from Mr. Savage, the Boston minister, the other day. He seems to be an intelligent and broad-minded man.

6 *October*.—I am just about to commence a reply to the criticisms of Sidgwick and others on the " Data of Ethics," to be published in the January number of *Mind*. After this is out of hand, I shall have done all my fighting for the present, and shall resume work quietly on the " Political Institutions."

8 *November*.—Tait made my criticism upon him the subject-matter of his inaugural lecture to the students at Edinburgh this year. . . . He is, as I hear, about to publish the lecture in *Nature*, and in that case we shall have a fight. If there is nothing in his lecture better than appears from this report, he will, I fancy, have to repent breaking silence.

Some little time ago a Mr. Richard Hodgson, Jr., a perfect stranger to me, a graduate of St. John's, Cambridge, wrote to me saying that he had been allowed, on his own request, to take as a subject, . . . the examination of Green's articles in the *Contemporary* of some two years ago, in which he made an attack upon

my metaphysical doctrine. Mr. Hodgson offered to send me his paper, and did so. It was very good in substance but too diffuse and unorganised; and after suggesting various omissions and a second time sending it back to him for further revision and abridgement, it has been reduced to a satisfactory form and is, I think, very telling. It has been sent to the *Contemporary*.[1]

30 *November*.—I have just got through my various small hindrances, including, among other things, the new division of the *Psychology*, . . . Unless Tait makes his threatened attack in *Nature*, for which I have been waiting for several weeks, I shall have done with my critics for some time to come, I hope, and shall be able to get on with my work more satisfactorily.

2 *December*.—Tait has been showing fight at last, and fired off his gun in the last number of *Nature*. . . . There will probably reach you, simultaneously with this, my rejoinder.

17 *December*.—In your copy of *Nature*, which I suppose will reach you at the same time with this letter, you will see the end of the Tait business. As I told you before the controversy began, I suspect he will repent having moved further in the matter.

10 *January*, 1881.—I thought I had finished my fighting for the present and pretty well settled all my critics. Still, there is something remaining to be done. Professor Green has answered Mr. Hodgson in the last number of the *Contemporary*, and I think it will be needful to take up the matter briefly myself.

The other day I found lying for me at the Athenæum a letter containing a copy of some verses *à propos* of

[1] *Contemporary Review*, December, 1880.

the fight with Tait. By way of amusement I send a copy.[1]

14 *February*.—I am just getting through a chapter on "Compound Political Heads"—the most perplexing chapter I had to write on any topic. When I have got it to my satisfaction I feel that I shall have done the hardest bit of work in this division. You saw the reply to Green in the *Contemporary*, I suppose. He has written to Strahan saying he does not intend to continue the matter, and requesting that his letter should be sent on to me. In it, while he does not confess that he is wrong in his representations, he apologises for the expressions he had used, which he admits to have been altogether out of taste. This controversy having come to an end I now feel free, and hope to avoid all such wastes of time for the future—especially as my critics are all as quiet as mice.

The following are from the diary at the end of 1880:—

19*th December*.—Called on Mrs. Cross and Lady Claud Hamilton. [On 20th he went to Hastings on a visit to the Busks.] 24th—Saw announced the death of Mrs. Cross. Telegraphed to Cross. Later, at his request, to the Dean of Westminster, and to Huxley and

[1] On a recent encounter between a great Counter and a great Accounter.

"Like braying ass doth Spencer bray,"
Cried Tait to raise the laugh.
"Nay, what he sells as wholesome wheat
Is simply wind-blown chaff."

When Spencer sharply pinked him for't,
Tait bawled, his class to cozen,
"He smites because I dared term six,
What he terms half-a-dozen!!"

When Spencer this poor fiction called,
What then did P. G. say?
"My facts called fictions, I shan't stand,"
He howled and ran away.

Tyndall. 29th.—" George Eliot's " funeral at Highgate. Large gathering, though very bad day.

The day before he called on Mrs. Cross she had written to him.

FROM MRS. CROSS (" GEORGE ELIOT ").

4, CHEYNE WALK,
18 *December*, 1880.

I have been slow to thank you for the kind present of your latest publications, of which I have made ample use, having re-read with Mr. Cross your " Data of Ethics," and the *Study of Sociology*. We saw that you had left your card at the Priory, and therefore we hope that you will find your way to this new home, where you would certainly be welcome.

At the foot of the above Spencer has written:—

I believe this was the last letter she wrote.[1] I called the next afternoon (Sunday) and had a long, pleasant talk with her—thought her looking worn, but she did not seem otherwise unwell. I little thought I should never see her more! She was taken ill that night, and I heard nothing of it until, at Hastings, I saw it announced in the papers that she had died on Wednesday night. Alas!

As " one of the very oldest and most valued of her friends," Spencer was the one to whom Mr. Cross naturally turned for assistance in carrying out his wife's wish to be buried in Westminster Abbey. Professor Tyndall warmly pressed her claims; but on hearing from Dean Stanley that the movement had been abandoned, he wrote to Spencer: " Between you and me I think this

[1] But see *George Eliot's Life*, iii., 438.

wise. Better far to bury her with silent reverence at Highgate, than to raise a clatter of tongues as to her claims to be buried in the Abbey." But the "clatter of tongues" was heard both in this country and in the United States, with reference to the part which Spencer had taken in her education. This erroneous statement, which had been repeated at intervals for many years, was at once rectified by a letter to the papers.[1]

During a week at Brighton, in March, he met the Leckys almost daily, played billiards most evenings with Mr. William Black, and was twice photographed by Mayall. It was probably with reference to one of these photographs that Professor Huxley wrote: "There is just a touch of severity in the eye. We shall hang it up in the dining-room, and if anybody is guilty of exaggerated expressions or bad logic (five womenkind habitually sit round that table) I think they will feel that that eye is upon them." From the diary may be culled the following items:—

27*th April*.—Finished by dictation memo. on the Physiology of Character. 9*th May*.—Club. Annual meeting. My service on the Committee ends, after seven years (two threes and a year on joint Committee). 12th.—To breakfast with Gladstone. 19th.—Gave dinner at Club to the Japanese minister, Bain, Masson, Morley, Frankland, Sir H. Thompson, and Lord Arthur Russell.

Owing to the articles on Political Institutions not meeting at home with the appreciation he had looked for, he urged Dr. Youmans, if he found their popularity decreasing in the United States, not to continue to pub-

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 429.

lish them. Dr. Youmans assured him that "we cannot get enough of this kind of discussion in our Magazine. There is no salvation for this continent except in the acquirement of some proximate scientific conception of the nature of Government." "There have been a few bursts of impatience, and one unhappy man in Pennsylvania wrote as follows: 'I sent you five dollars for the *Monthly* some months ago; either stop those stupid articles of Spencer or stop my subscription.'"

Thinking that Professor Goldwin Smith had denounced scientific doctrine as tending to give a charter to personal and political selfishness and tyranny, he induced Miss Bevington to reply.

To Miss L. S. Bevington.

18 *May*, 1881.

To the passage you copy from Goldwin Smith's article, which is evidently consequent upon a protest I made to him personally when we met at Buxton, and when I reproached him for this misrepresentation, you might make a very effectual reply. In the first place, you may remark that this assertion that their [men of science] conduct was due to the lingering effect of their theology is purely hypothetical. He has not a particle of evidence that such is the fact. And then, passing over that, you may remark that if it be as he alleges, then we have the remarkable anomaly that whereas the class of men who not only have been brought up under the old theology, but still adhere to it, show relatively little humanity, relatively much humanity is shown by those who, brought up under it, have abandoned it. That is to say, the effect of the alleged cause is the greatest where it has ceased to be in operation. Those on whom it continually acts show less of this effect than those on whom it long ago ceased to act.

"The Inhumanity of the Orthodox" was suggested by Spencer as a title, but Miss Bevington thought that would be "too pugnacious, and would assuredly offend many half-way minds." The article appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* for August, under the heading "The Moral Colour of Rationalism." Professor Goldwin Smith's answer to it in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1882, was dealt with by Spencer in the March number of the same review.

His holiday movements are alluded to in a letter to Mr. Lott, dated, Ardtornish, 10 July.

I went to Ballater and Braemar,[1] not having before seen that region, and having the option of subsequently going to Dr. Priestley's place on the Spey, and having some fishing there. However, on Friday last, I got Valentine Smith's letter asking me here, and I started next morning, having seen something of the Grampians, but not having explored the chief places of interest. The only picturesque mountain I saw is Lochnagar.

I stay here till the close of the month and then go to the British Association. I had not intended to go, but two invitations—to Escrick Park and to Fryston—which promise to make the week or ten days pass agreeably, have turned the scale.

To Miss Flora Smith.

Escrick Park,
3 *September*, 1881.

Escrick is very tame after Ardtornish. Undulating greensward does not adequately replace rock and moor; and herds of fallow-deer constantly seen are less interesting than red-deer seen occasionally. However, the

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 439.

internal attractiveness is considerable if the external is not. The circle is agreeable; our hostess charming as ever; and our host . . . pleasant and cordial. Since Wednesday, Association proceedings have absorbed all the time, and this is the first morning on which I have found time for writing.

To E. L. Youmans.

21 *September,* 1881.

I am glad to hear that you are gaining strength,—not so glad to hear that you are "more in the spirit of work." If instead of this you would write "more in the spirit of play," it would be very much better. . . .

I am glad that you like the two chapters on the "Militant Type" and the "Industrial Type." They are, in fact, the culminating chapters of the part, and, indeed, of the whole work, in point of importance.

8 *October.*—I count Fairbairn's attack[1] as having been decidedly advantageous in virtue of its sequence in the shape of your article in the number of the *Monthly* just received. . . . It adds but another to the many illustrations of your admirable faculty of exposition, at once lucid and popular, and especially showing the aptitude for seizing the cardinal points.

The visit to America was now assuming definite shape. What he dreaded most was "the bother of having to see so many people, but I suppose I must make up my mind to go through it as well as I can." While his New York friend was planning how to make the proposed visit pleasant and profitable, Spencer was thinking over various measures for enabling Dr. Youmans to tide over

[1] *Contemporary Review* for July and August.

the ensuing winter. "In furtherance of my advice to go south for the winter, I wish you would appropriate, in advance, the proceeds of my next half-year's account with the Appletons, which will, I suppose, be something over £100. If you agree to this it may facilitate your plans, and will put you under no obligation. It will still leave me immensely your debtor." Though not accepting this offer, Dr. Youmans was grateful for the generosity that prompted it. "I am already indebted to you for the funds advanced when we went to the Mediterranean, and if I have said nothing about its payment, it is not because I have forgotten what I owe you." When pressing his offer again in November, "not as a loan, but as an acknowledgment of obligation," Spencer added: "As for Riviera expenses, I never dreamed of the present position of things being changed—as you would soon find if you proposed to reimburse me."

About the middle of 1881 Mr. Alfred R. Wallace had tried to interest him in the Land Nationalisation Society, which was an outcome of Mr. Wallace's reading of *Social Statics*. Looking upon *Social Statics* as "having in some degree ploughed the ground for his own book," Mr. Henry George had expected Spencer to welcome *Progress and Poverty*. Early in 1882 they met at a reception given by Mrs. Jeune (now Lady St. Helier). The meeting was a great disappointment to Mr. George. Here were probably sown the seeds of the virulence with which he attacked Spencer some years later.

The announcement of the cessation of the *Descriptive Sociology* led to a generous offer being made by Mr. Hegeler, of La Salle, Illinois.[1]

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 414, 440.

To B. Hegeler.

14 *February,* 1882.

I have this morning received your sympathetic letter with its enclosed Bill of Exchange for £204. . . . I thank you very cordially, and admire very greatly the generosity which has prompted your gift; but you must excuse me if I do not accept it. . . .

It is interesting and encouraging to find here and there men whose interest in the diffusion of advanced ideas, and whose care for what they hold to be the welfare of the race, prompts not only so much active generosity, but also personal efforts of a more active kind. These are above all wanted. The great deficiency on the part of men is that the feeling enlisted on behalf of their convictions is not sufficiently strong to prompt any sacrifice of time and labour in spreading them.

On hearing of the proposed visit to America Mr. Hegeler asked to be allowed to pay all the expenses incurred by Spencer and Mr. Lott there and back—an offer which was also gratefully declined. Mr. Hegeler was, moreover, one of the first to furnish capital to push the sale of the *Descriptive Sociology* in the United States. For this object Dr. Youmans had several plans, though he had said little about them, because, as he wrote, " the tenure of my strength is insecure, and because, even when stronger, I could never half carry out my plans. My career is so strewn with the fragments of unexecuted projects that I think it time to stop talking at least." All he asked Spencer for was a free hand. Capital could be secured to move the work vigorously, if the price could be reduced. " But everybody agrees that between its ugly form and its large cost it is commercially impracticable."

In 1880 Spencer had been invited to join in an address to be presented to Lord Kimberley "on the native question in South Africa," arising out of the disarming of the Basutos. The memorialists were in favour of removing the Government of Basuto territory from Cape Colony to the Home Government.

To F. W. Chesson.

18 *November,* 1880.

I should have been glad to join in the manifestation of opinion to be made by the Deputation to which you invite me to-day, had I been able to agree in the special proposal made. But in the face of multitudinous experiences, it does not seem to me that the transforming the Basuto and other such territories into Crown Colonies would permanently secure the end in view. So long as it is felt by colonists that when they aggress on natives and get into quarrels, the home government will come to their defence, and so long as men who initiate aggressive policies, which end in the annexation of territory, get titles and honours, notwithstanding their unauthorised actions and even their disobedience to orders, the filibustering policy with all its atrocities will continue.

Looking about for a powerful pen to stir up the national conscience he bethought him of Mr. Swinburne.

To Algernon Charles Swinburne.

8 *March,* 1881.

Some two years ago I obtained with considerable difficulty a copy of your "Word of an English Republican on the Muscovite Crusade"—wishing to foster it as something worthy to be preserved as an example of magnificent writing. The other day, after reading some passages of it to a friend and evoking from him also

great admiration, it occurred to me that your marvellous powers of expressing well-justified anger might be fitly used at the present time in condemnation of our filibustering atrocities all over the world. You have, I doubt not, been in a chronic state of indignation daily intensified, by our doings in Afghanistan, in Zululand, in the Transvaal, and on a smaller scale in other places. There never was, I think, an opportunity for a more scathing exposure of the contrast between our Christian creed and pagan doings, our professed philanthropy and our actual savagery, and I long to see the traits of the matter presented with that extreme power and pungency with which you exposed Mr. Carlyle's creed and his absurd inconsistency. I cannot imagine anything more telling than a pamphlet by you, written after the same manner, and holding up to the English people a glass in which they might rightly see themselves and their doings.

Pray consider the matter, and if you can do so, yield to my suggestion.

Mr. Swinburne was "sincerely and deeply gratified" on learning that what he had written "on a practical question of national politics" had seemed to Spencer deserving of a different notice from that vouchsafed by the press. But he did not see his way to come forward at that time with a volunteer's contribution to the political literature of the day. Mr. Swinburne's refusal was a great disappointment to Spencer, who needed all the help he could summon in the crusade he was about to enter upon.

A motion by Mr. Henry Richard in the House of Commons respecting the conduct of civil and military agents in the Colonies, suggested to Spencer that the time had come for action. Steps were taken to secure the co-operation of those whose sympathies were sup-

posed to be in favour of the movement. A circular was drawn up, the rough draft of which in Spencer's own handwriting, and dated 16 June, 1881, was "done under pressure in forty minutes."

To John Bright.

2 *July*, 1881.

When some six weeks ago I had the pleasure of a conversation with you at Lord Airlie's on the subject of the antagonism between industrial progress and war, I stupidly forgot to name the fact that I had been for some time past contemplating an attempt to gather together the large amount of diffused opinion against our aggressive policy, which now tells but little because it is unorganised.

My leading idea was and is that the efforts of the Peace Society are practically paralysed by its identification with the principle of non-resistance. . . . My belief is that all the difficulties hence arising may be excluded by having in place of the principle of non-resistance the principle of non-aggression, which for all practical purposes would prove equally efficient.

At a meeting held on July 11 Spencer's circular of June 16 was discussed, and slightly modified before being sent out in search of adherents. Many subsequent meetings had to be attended, and much correspondence carried on between that date and the end of the year. Suffice it to say that the reception given to the circular was sufficiently favourable to justify the convening of a public meeting early in 1882, with a view to which an address, setting forth the principal objects of the proposed League, was drawn up by Spencer. As the date of the meeting came nearer he felt more and more out of sorts. The diary says:—

19*th February*.—Getting worried with A.A.L. matters. 20th.—Anti-Aggression League arrangements. 22nd.—Much business. Feared should collapse, but did not. Anti-Aggression League meeting took place quite successfully. I spoke well, and was much complimented.

Until he saw how little attention was given to the movement by the London press, he had hoped to interest French liberal papers in it. But the day after the meeting he wrote to Dr. Cazelles, expressing disappointment with the reports. "The tremendous disturbance in the House of Commons about the case of Mr. Bradlaugh had the double effect of keeping away very many members of Parliament who had promised to attend, and the further effect of occupying so large a space in the papers as to leave little room for the report of the meeting." As evidence of the popular estimate of the relative importance of events, he mentions that the *Times* of February 23 had no notice of the meeting at all, and that the *Daily Telegraph* devoted half a column to a report of the meeting, and about three columns to Jumbo, the elephant. Three weeks later (March 15) the *Times* published Tennyson's English and Colonial song—"Hands all Round." Two of the lines near the end ran—

> "Pray God our greatness may not fail
> Through craven fears of being great."

Spencer himself tried his hand at a poem in reprobation, under the title, "The Craven Fear of being Great," but got no further than two stanzas. At the foot of these he has pencilled: "I was made very angry by some verses of Tennyson's having the above burden, and began to write a reply."

The writing of a paper of "Anti-Aggression League Memoranda," describing the origin of the movement, and the policy which in his opinion should be pursued both in Parliament and in the country, in carrying out its aims, drove him back to Brighton on March 15. Turning to the diary one reads:—

16*th March*.—Train to Arundel. Spent morning in Park. Some revising. . . . Evening, billiards with Black. 17th.—Walked with Bridge [his Secretary], sitting down to dictate occasionally. Evening with Black. 18th.—Walking and dictating to Bridge in morning. Afternoon walking. Evening with Black playing billiards. 19th.—Evening, billiards with Black and Lockyer. [To London on 22nd.] 24th.—Ended chapter on Political Retrospect and Prospect. Finished vol. ii. of the *Sociology*, SO ENDING HARDEST BIT OF WORK. Dined at Huxley's.

To E. L. YOUMANS.

29 *March*, 1882.

You will rejoice with me that this division of my work is now completed. I regard it as by far the most difficult piece of work I have had to do, and now that I am through with it I feel that what is to come is comparatively plain sailing.

The diary for April 26 says: "Attended Darwin's funeral at Westminster Abbey." Some misunderstanding gave rise to the following letter:—

To GEORGE DARWIN.

4 *May*, 1882.

Thank you for your explanatory letter. I regret that any misunderstanding should have entailed on you the trouble of writing it. I fancy some remark of Huxley's

(made probably to Galton and then to you) to the effect that my very pronounced non-conformity in the matter of ecclesiastical ceremonies (which he knew had prevented me from being present at Tyndall's marriage) might perhaps be an obstacle to my attendance. But I felt the occasion of your father's funeral to be so exceptional that I could not let this feeling prevent me from manifesting my great respect. . . .

If anything could serve as adequate consolation to Mrs. Darwin and yourself it would be the immense manifestation of sympathy—a manifestation which I should think has never been paralleled in the case of any man of science.

The League continued to involve much correspondence and many interviews. Efforts were made to adjust terms of union with other societies, such as the International Arbitration Co-operative Society, and Mr. Cremer's Workman's Peace Association. The Egyptian imbroglio was taken up—a Memorandum on " The crisis in Egypt " being prepared by Spencer, embodying the substance of a circular addressed to the members of the League by the Executive Committee. Spencer thought that the opportunity should be taken " to express somewhat more sympathy with the Government in the difficulty of its position than has thus far been done." " If, while advocating a non-aggressive policy, the League could be represented as sympathising with the Ministry in its difficulties, much might be done towards conciliating those whose aid is important."

To the Right Hon. John Bright.

24 *June*, 1882.

On Thursday I had the pleasure of breakfasting with Mr. Gladstone, and had after breakfast a quarter of an

hour's talk with him concerning the Anti-Aggression League. He expressed his entire sympathy with its aims. He felt the need for it, saying, to use his own words, that the Peace Society had "botched the matter" by its impracticable principle; and he recognised the fact that our aims were in harmony with the progress of Liberalism at large.

In consequence of this conversation I next day forwarded to him a copy of the report of our inaugural meeting, and drew his attention to the address setting forth the aims of the League. . . . He has written me himself a note in which he expresses, to use his own words, "not literally or formally concurrence, but very hearty sympathy."

He asked me whether I had communicated with you on the matter, and I said that you had expressed yourself sympathetically.

Now I think that under these circumstances there is encouragement to decided action. If you will speak to Mr. Pennington you will find from him that sundry of those who, besides himself and Mr. Samuel Morley, wish to aid us are deterred by the fear of hampering the ministry—especially now that the Egyptian business complicates matters. Now if it could be known among such that not only do you sympathise with us, but that Mr. Gladstone does so too in respect of our general aims, the difficulty would disappear and we should at once have ample and probably energetic aid.

It would be difficult to say which feeling was stronger —that roused by the aggressions of the Government on weaker nationalities, or that roused by the aggressions of the State on the liberties of citizens. He counselled co-operation between different societies to protect the individual liberties of citizens. Writing to Mr. W. C. Croft in December, 1881, he said:

In our day Toryism and Liberalism have become confused, and the line between them has to be drawn afresh. Toryism stands for the coercive power of the State *versus* the freedom of the individual. Liberalism stands for the freedom of the individual *versus* the power of the State. At present the Liberal party have lost sight of their essential principle, and a new Liberal party has to be formed to re-assert it.

No documents can be found with which to supplement the account of the visit to America given in Chapter LVIII. of the *Autobiography*. It is true, we have the diary, which on more than one occasion has helped to complete the narrative. When one turns to it, however, it soon becomes apparent that the chapter describing the visit to America must have been dictated with the diary in his hands, nothing of interest being left for the biographer. As for the absence of documents, that is explained by the cessation of his ordinary correspondence while he was away. At most only a few letters passed between him and his friends and acquaintances who offered their services with a view to render the visit as comfortable, enjoyable, and instructive as possible. The managers of the great railways vied with one another in offering him luxurious travelling facilities. Hotel proprietors showed in every possible way their desire to welcome him as an honoured guest. Friends heaped upon him and Mr. Lott unbounded private hospitalities and unwearied kindnesses. And, to crown all, there was the banquet given to him at Delmonico's by leading representatives of American thought and enterprise, the remembrance of which, he said in the speech he delivered on the occasion, would " ever continue to be a source of

pleasurable emotion, exceeded by few, if any, of my remembrances."

That Spencer was deeply touched by the genuine warmth of the welcome he received wherever he went in the United States and Canada is certain. No one regretted more than he did that he could not avail himself to a larger extent of the facilities for enjoyment so freely placed at his disposal. The pity of it was that he could not throw off that morbid dread of social excitement, the imagination of which, in this instance as in many others, did him more harm than the reality would have done. Mr. Lott had, one can well believe, a very trying time acting as " buffer " between his friend and interviewers, not even finding time to visit his own relatives in Chicago, though that was one of the objects he had in view when he offered to accompany Spencer as far as New York. Spencer's dislike to being lionised showed itself on his arrival at Liverpool. Immediately on landing he took train to London: thus depriving Mr. Robert Holt and others of the pleasure they had looked forward to of giving him a complimentary dinner as a welcome home and as an expression of their warm regard and admiration.

To E. L. Youmans.

25 *November,* 1882.

You were amused, I daresay, to find that I was actually interviewed after all; just at the last moment on board the " Germanic." A *Herald* reporter got hold of me, and, before I was aware who he was, managed to get some remarks out of me which I probably should either not have made, or should have expressed differently if I had been on my guard. I suspected immediately afterward what had happened. . . .

I find I have lost about half a stone in weight. I was worn while with you, more than I have been these many years; and was conscious that among other evil effects of my nervous debility, there were aberrations of word and deed in various small matters which annoyed me very much afterward to recall.

12 *December*.—This morning I got the copy of the pamphlet.[1] . . . I have glanced through the parts which were new to me; and have found my nerves somewhat tried by the amount of eulogy. I am not without fear that it may cause, in some minds, a reaction. However, in America you are so accustomed to having things strongly put, that I suppose such an effect is not so likely to be produced as it would be here.

Now, as always, you have in your own remarks seized all the essential points and presented them in the clearest way. I know no one who has the art of saying in so brief a space that which most needs saying. You know I never pay a compliment with an "i." Mine is always a complement with an "e"—that which is due. . . .

I join in the great regret for Draper's death, when he was just getting into conditions for doing his best work. The scientific world has been very unfortunate this year. Jevons, Balfour, Draper—all men from whom much was to be hoped.

[1] *Herbert Spencer on the Americans, and the Americans on Herbert Spencer*. New York: D. Appleton and Co. This gives a complete report of an "interview" pre-arranged between Dr. Youmans and himself, which was published in the New York papers of October 20. It contains also an account of the banquet given in his honour at Delmonico's on November 9, with full reports of the speeches delivered on the occasion, as well as of speeches not delivered, and letters of regret for absence from distinguished men in different parts of the United States. The "interview" and Spencer's speech were afterwards published in the *Contemporary Review* for January, 1883; and were finally included in the *Essays* (iii., 471).

CHAPTER XVII

A POLITICAL CREED FOR TRUE LIBERALISM

(*January,* 1883—*December,* 1885)

THE year 1883 opened not very hopefully, though, as far as health was concerned, things were not so bad as he thought. A visit was paid to a Hydropathic establishment at Tunbridge Wells, " not with a view to the ordinary treatment, but with a view rather to fresh air and a pleasant place for passing the time." It did not prove such a " pleasant place " after all; the entries in the diary for the three nights he spent there being—" very good night," " poor night," " very bad night."

To E. L. YOUMANS.

9 *January,* 1883.

I enclose some pages from the *Medical Times and Gazette* [6 Jan.], sent to me the other day by Dr. Hughlings Jackson. The initiative he made years ago by applying the doctrine of dissolution to interpretation of nervous disorders—an initiative that is now being followed and in that direction—seems likely to lead to other results. The paper is very clearly and conclusively argued; and is to me just as much a revelation as was that which Hughlings Jackson made of the doctrine.

Yesterday I received a copy of Savage's sermon, from which you made a quotation. The part I had not seen is remarkably good, and puts very clearly and eloquently the points on which Fiske also had insisted. I think

something ought to come out of the movement of which Savage appears to be the most distinct head.

Gratified by Spencer's endorsement of his attempt "to re-construct religion and ethical teaching on the basis of Evolution," Mr. Savage sent copies of the sermon to London for distribution. About this Spencer wrote to Professor Huxley and other friends:—

It is long since I have been so excessively annoyed as I was yesterday on learning that Mr. Williams, my publisher, has been sending to some of my friends copies of a sermon by the Rev. Mr. Savage, of Boston. He has done it entirely without any authority from me, and without giving me the slightest reason to suppose that he was about to do it. Otherwise I should have given him a very peremptory interdict.

The fact was, Spencer never felt quite at ease with the demonstrative activities of some of his American admirers, and often reminded them that things which would be considered matters of course on the other side of the Atlantic, were viewed in a different light on this side.

One of the "excitements" of which he complains arose from the Kantian Revival and criticisms connected with it.

To Richard Hodgson.

16 *January*, 1883.

I wish you would look at some of the writings of the Neo-Kantians, who are becoming dominant, and who, as for example, Watson, think they have made unanswerable attacks upon Evolutionary Empiricism. Their policy throughout appears to be to evade or ignore entirely the criticisms made on Kant, and to pass on to raise

other issues. I have nowhere met with any attempt whatever to meet the objections I have made to the Kantian doctrine of Space, set forth in the *Psychology*.

Moreover, there is another very effectual movement of attack to be made against them. They deliberately ignore the position which I have insisted upon, that every scheme of philosophy must set out by taking for granted such data of consciousness as are involved in the very action of intelligence; since thought cannot stir a step towards any conclusions whatever without positing these, any more than the body can move without using its limbs. Disregarding this truth, the Kantian critique sets out without asking what are the things involved in the very first act of judgment which must be made in positing any fundamental proposition in philosophy, and without recognising the truth that the validity of this act of judgment cannot be proved by anything preceding it, but must be subsequently justified by the congruity of all results that are subsequently arrived at in conformity with this first act. I have, as you may remember, pointed out that the fundamental question is—why is one dictum of consciousness accepted as true rather than some counter-dictum?—finding the answer to this question in the testing of the relative cohesions among states of consciousness. Clearly this necessary determinant of choice among judgments must precede in authority all such judgments as those with which Kant sets out. But the Kantists ignore this truth, and suppose themselves to have undisputed authority for the primary judgments they start from—do not apparently suspect that their authority for them may be challenged by asking why the deliverance of consciousness which yields them, must be held valid rather than the opposite deliverance of consciousness.

The Kantians think they have gone behind other philosophies. The thing to be done is to go behind them, and to show [that] the true "form of thought," is a relation between states of consciousness, and the true process

of thought a survival of the more coherent relations in the struggle for existence.

To G. Croom Robertson.

22 *January,* 1883.

Probably you have already looked at an article in the current number of the *Edinburgh* on the "Kantian Revival." Joined with some other incentives which have arisen of late, as, for instance, the criticisms contained in the work of Professor Watson, I feel prompted to say a few words about the matter in so far as it concerns myself.

My notion is not that of entering into any controversy at present, but simply to draw attention to my own objections to the Kantian philosophy, and to ask for answers to these before I proceed further. I am perfectly prepared for the issue raised by Watson and others; but before thinking it worth while to meet it I propose that they shall meet the issues I have raised.

To Dr. Youmans he writes: "I enclose you a copy of a page of the *St. James' Gazette* (14 February), in which I recently published a letter which you will find there. I was glad to have the opportunity of giving the *Edinburgh Review* a wipe; and I was not sorry to have the occasion of publicly repudiating Mr. Henry George." In this letter to the *St. James' Gazette* he says:—

I suppose that now, when, after I have been publishing books for a third of a century, "the leading critical organ" has recognised my existence, I ought to feel thankful. . . . But such elation as I might otherwise be expected to feel is checked by two facts. One is that the *Edinburgh Review* has not itself discovered me, but has had its attention drawn to me by quotations in the

work of Mr. Henry George. The other is that . . . the reviewer . . . is apparently unconscious that I have written other books, . . . that the last of them, "Political Institutions," contains passages concerning the question he discusses. Writers in critical journals which have reputations to lose usually seek out the latest version of an author's views.

His speech at the banquet at Delmonico's was still being discussed in the American Press. Not only the soundness of the dictum—"Life is not for learning, nor is life for working, but learning and working are for life"—but even its originality, was called in question. "We have had somewhat too much of the gospel of work," Spencer said. "It is time to preach the gospel of relaxation." In a book on "American Nervousness" Dr. George M. Beard had already urged that "the gospel of work must make way for the gospel of rest." In a pamphlet on "Herbert Spencer on American Nervousness: A Scientific Coincidence," he now drew attention to the similarity of Spencer's much talked of maxim to his own published opinion. Dr. Youmans had no difficulty in showing how slight the coincidence was, and also mentioned having "heard Mr. Spencer give expression to the main idea of his address long before the name of Dr. Beard was ever publicly heard of. It was an early outcome of his evolution studies."

To E. L. Youmans.

8 *March,* 1883.

The incident is very annoying. Had I known that he had used an antithesis so like that which I have used I should most carefully have avoided it. The phrase

" gospel of relaxation " was first used by me in the course of a discussion with Mr. Garrett when we were at Montebello; and at the time of using I thought I will try and make that stick. As to my general view you say very rightly that it is of long standing. I am glad you remembered that many years ago I contended (somewhat to your surprise, I think, at the time) that the æsthetic element in life would in the future, take a larger development than now.

One outcome of his speech was the formation in New York of the Twilight Club, of which he accepted an honorary membership. " I would, however, remark that the reports of your proceedings seem to imply rather more gravity of speech in your conversations than is altogether consistent with the ' expectation of relaxation.' "

At Birmingham a movement was on foot that had important consequences, leading to friendship with Mr. W. R. Hughes and Mr. F. Howard Collins, and years of unstinted services on the part of the latter. The Birmingham Natural History and Microscopical Society, of which Spencer was an Honorary Vice-President, had decided to form a Sociological section, the opening meeting of which took place in May.[1] When this was brought to the notice of Dr. Youmans as an example to be imitated, it elicited the remark: " This matter of an organisation in New York has been much on my mind, but I have not seen my way to move in it. It is the easiest city in the world to start anything; the hardest to continue anything."

[1] *Nature*, 19 April and 17 May. A letter from Spencer, dated 20 March, is printed in the *Midland Naturalist*, June, 1883.

To E. L. Youmans.

12 *April,* 1883.

Your reference to the cheap edition of the *Data of Ethics* reminds me by the title of an interesting bit of information I had the other day from the Japanese Minister over here, to the effect that they have issued a translation of it in Japanese. I was rather amused to think of the amount of bother they would have to render some of the words; and also bethought me that their furniture of ideas, apart from the difficulty of translation, would scarcely enable them to follow the argument. However, they are a sharp people.

. . . I am beginning quietly to take measures for preparing a final edition of my *Essays*. . . . My method is simply to take with me to the Athenæum a sheet for revision, and do half an hour's work upon it in the course of the afternoon. . . . This will get me through at such rate that by the time other things are out of hand the three volumes will be ready for the press. . . . When I speak of other work being out of hand I refer more especially to a new edition of the first volume of the *Sociology,* to which there will be appended the complete references. . . . I am making an engagement with an expert—the librarian of the Athenæum Club, a very clever and very erudite young fellow—to go through them all and verify and correct all details.

The following has reference to an article by Lord Pembroke in which some of Spencer's views were criticised.

To the Earl of Pembroke.

2 *May,* 1883.

I am much obliged by your letter of explanation and the manifestation of kind feeling implied by it—and all the more so because I do not know that in its absence I should have felt any explanation required. Having my-

self never allowed personal considerations to prevent me from candidly expressing in a public way my criticisms upon others, I, of course, always expect to be dealt with in like manner, and so far as I remember, have never felt aggrieved by criticisms however trenchant when fairly made. Indeed regarding it as a duty to express my own dissent from the views of others on important matters, I necessarily recognise it to be a duty on the part of others to express dissent from my views where the question at issue is of moment. And I fully recognise the fact that those, who like yourself, hold positions which call upon them to act and therefore to form definite judgments are bound by public duty to oppose beliefs which they think erroneous, and, where the matter is important, to freely state, for the benefit of others, their reasons for doing this. I have ever insisted that things will go well when each utters and endeavours to get accepted that which he thinks to be the truth, leaving the average opinion produced to work out such results as it may.

To E. L. Youmans.

17 *May,* 1883.

I lately took up a book at the Athenæum entitled *Natural Law in the Spiritual World,* by Henry Drummond. I found it to be in considerable measure an endeavour to press me into the support of a qualified theology, by showing the harmony between certain views of mine and alleged spiritual laws. It is an interesting example of one of the transitional books which are at present very useful. It occurs to me that while the author proposes to press me into his service, we might advantageously press him into our service. Just look at the book and see.

By this post I send you a copy of yesterday's *Standard* in which you will see a leading article concerning my election to the French Academy. I affix also at the top of the page a cutting from the *Pall Mall Gazette* giving

a different version of the election, which I suspect is the true one. If it is the true one, which I am taking steps to ascertain, then it appears that while the vacancy in the higher grade of membership made by the death of Emerson is filled by the promotion of Sir Henry Maine from the lower grade to the higher, I am invited to accept the vacant place left by this promotion of Sir Henry Maine. If I accept, it seems to me that I am by implication recognising the propriety of this estimate of relative claims. Sir Henry Maine is my junior by two years, and he is in his standing as an author my junior by ten years; so that no plea of seniority can be alleged: it comes unquestionably to a judgment of our respective positions. . . .

I have been hesitating for a day or two. . . . Seeing that as the majority by which I was elected was so great (27 to 2), and that it might be ungracious to refuse this, which is in some sort an international courtesy, I felt somewhat inclined to commit the inconsistency of accepting that which I had in previous cases refused. But if it turns out that I am asked to authorise and endorse that academic judgment which ranks me as lower than Sir Henry Maine, I feel very strongly inclined to take the course I originally intended.

24 *May*.—I am sending off to-day my letter to the French Academy, declining the so-called honour they have done me, in electing me a correspondent. . . .

I received from the Secretary of the Academy an official letter which runs as follows:—

"Sir, I have the honour to inform you that at the meeting to-day, May 12, the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences elected you correspondent in the section of Philosophy, in place of Mr. Tappan deceased."

. . . In any case the fact is that Emerson's death having made a vacancy in the class of associates, Sir Henry Maine is promoted from the list of correspondents to fill his place; and into that list of correspondents I

am drafted to fill the place of Mr. Tappan. "Who is Mr. Tappan?" will be the general question. . . .

The whole transaction is, I think, so thoroughly absurd, that it affords a good opportunity for a trenchant criticism, not upon the French Academy alone, but upon academic selections generally.

To Jules Simon.

May, 1883.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your communication informing me that the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques has elected me a correspondent in the section of philosophy, in the place of Mr. Tappan, deceased. Along with my thanks for the intended honour, will you please convey to the members of the Academy the following reasons which oblige me to decline it. The first of them may conveniently be given in the words used by me when, some twelve years ago, I declined an honorary degree offered to me here:—

"Certain convictions which have been long growing up in me, respecting the effects of honorary titles, will, however, I fear, stand in the way of my acceptance of the degree which the Professors kindly suggest should be conferred upon me. I have come to the conclusion that such honorary titles, while they seem to be encouragements to intellectual achievement, do, in reality, by their indirect influences, act as discouragements.

"If, supposing due discrimination were possible, men of much promise received from a learned body such marks of distinction as would bespeak attention from the world at large, I can well imagine that such men would be greatly helped, and would oftentimes be saved from sinking in their struggles with adverse circumstances in the midst of a society prepossessed in favour of known men. But there ordinarily comes no such aid until the difficulties have been surmounted—supposing, that is, that they have not proved fatal.

"Probably it will be said that because honorary titles do not commonly yield benefits so great as they might yield if given earlier, it does not therefore follow that when given they are otherwise than beneficial. I think, however, that if, instead of considering their direct effects on those older men who have received them, we consider their indirect effects on those younger men who have not received them, we shall see that to these they become, practically, an additional obstacle to success. Always the impediments in the way of one who, without authority, enters the field of intellectual activity, in competition with those having established authorities, are sufficiently great. The probability that he has nothing to say worth listening to, is so strong, that he is almost certain to receive for a long time scarcely any of the attention he may well deserve. But this unavoidable difficulty is made artificially greater when, bearing no stamp of value, he has for competitors those who, to the advantages of known achievements, add the advantage of officially-stamped values. The larger reading world, and the narrower critical world which leads it, are greatly biassed by whatever bespeaks respectful consideration. And if the presence of an honorary title gives this positive advantage to one bearing it, its absence involves a positive disadvantage to one not bearing it."[1]

The evils resulting from this system (which, were it allowable to adopt a word from sportsmen, might be called inverse handicapping)—these evils which, during the earlier part of my career, were revealed to me by personal experiences, are not the sole evils caused. Even leaving out of consideration those who do not receive these honorary titles from Universities and Academies, and limiting our attention to those who do receive them, it may, I think, be shown that the distribution inevitably involves both personal injustices and public mischiefs. It must do this whether the choice of those to be hon-

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 273.

oured is ideally good or whether it is such as we actually see.

Supposing that the selection is made with perfect fairness and the best judgment, it is manifest that the number of those at any time existing who bear these marks of honour, is so great that there must be an immense contrast between the claims of the few higher in the group and the claims of the many lower, who are nevertheless made to appear equally worthy of being distinguished from the mass of cultured persons. If society at large is at all influenced by these titles (and if not they are wholly futile), then, inevitably, the tendency is to equalize in public estimation those who bear them; and while unduly raising the inferior, to do this at the expense of depressing the superior.

But it must, I think, be admitted that the distribution is *not* guided by either correct appreciation or unbiassed feeling. Besides the personal favouritisms and antipathies which occasionally influence it, the selection is inevitably influenced very greatly by the religious bias, and in a considerable degree by the political bias. It is further swayed by the bias which the leading men of a University or an Academy have in favour of this or that school of thought, scientific or literary. And since every established body tends to become conservative, the titles it confers are tolerably sure to be distributed in such way as to encourage the upholders of traditional views and to discourage the advocates of those newer views which are in course of replacing them.

The perversions of choice resulting from the co-operation of all these causes are notorious. Any one who, in our English and Scotch calendars, reads the five hundred and more names to which are affixed LL.D. or D.C.L., can scarcely avoid smiling at the irony of fate which has united under the same badge men so distinguished with men so undistinguished. And though in the groups of those who bear titles given by Academies on the Continent the differences in respect of capacities or achieve-

ments may not be so extreme, still they are sufficiently striking.

But it is not only, or chiefly, the effect upon individual *status* which is objectionable, the effect upon public opinion is even more objectionable. The mass of men accept their beliefs on authority; and beliefs which bear the endorsement of a University or an Academy appear to them more acceptable than those which are avowedly or tacitly rejected by it. Hence, during each transition period, occupied in the conquest of old ideas by new, honorary titles accorded by such a body to the defenders of the old, and long withheld from the propagators of the new, necessarily retard the change.

I may add that these evils are increased when Academies separate the foreign members affiliated to them into two ranks; since by thus giving judgment, or appearing to give judgment, respecting the comparative merits of men elected, now to the higher and now to the lower rank, they affect the public estimate of the comparative authorities of their opinions or writings. For reasons like those assigned above, these academic estimates of relative worth are not unfrequently erroneous, and are therefore misleading to the public at large.

Beyond these general reasons which sway me, there is a special reason. Already on three successive occasions I have declined a correspondentship accorded to me by a foreign academy. Manifestly, I cannot now accept a correspondentship from the French Academy without passing a deliberate slight upon each of these three academies. As it would be improper to do this, there remains no alternative for me but to persist in the course which I have already pursued, and again to decline.

Conscious as I am that the Members of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, in electing me by so large a majority, have testified in a marked way their sympathy, and, in a measure, their approval, I regret that I am obliged thus to respond in what seems an ungracious manner. But, as will be seen, the motives

which prompt me are strong, and the last of them peremptory.

For a time Dr. Youmans was disinclined to meddle with such high and delicate personal matters. When he did take it up, it was mainly because "it seemed to be an opportunity to reinforce a view that I am more and more inclined to regard as important. The erroneous view of your relation to Darwin is very wide-spread." On this Spencer remarked (3 September, 1883):—

I see that you have turned the incident into "capital" with great effect: making, indeed, much more of it than I had thought of. It has been an early custom in various parts of the world, and was the custom even in the highlands, for chiefs to have official orators. Somebody will be noting the fact, and saying that I must have appointed you as mine; and that a most eloquent one you are. Certainly no man ever had another who set forth his claims so persistently or effectually.

The first half of July he was at Inveroran, disappointed with the fishing—not catching even one salmon to send with congratulations to Professor Huxley on election as President of the Royal Society.[1] After a few weeks at Ardtornish he turned homewards, travelling *via* Fort William, Kingussie, Grantown, Edinburgh and Derby.

To Miss Flora Smith.

Edinburgh,
11 *August*, 1883.

As I came away from Ardtornish I gazed with sad eyes on the scenes where I had known such kind friends

[1] *Life of Professor Huxley*, ii., 57.

and passed so many happy days—my presentiment being that I was seeing them for the last time; for I fear that I am on the way to become a wreck, fit for nothing and for no society. The chief qualification to my melancholy was the thought of the genuine sympathy and the anxiety for my welfare which you had shown. I shall always remember them with gratitude.

To E. L. Youmans.

London, 21 *August,* 1883.

The same post lately brought me three letters from the antipodes—one from an ardent disciple in Australia, and the others from Collier and from Sir George Grey, in New Zealand, both describing the growth of influence out there.[1] . . .

Such small amount of work as I have been doing since I left town, is devoted to revision of my *Essays.* . . . There will be an important supplement to the Essay on the "Origin and Function of Music." . . . In it, while defending my own view *versus* that of Darwin, I shall make a general criticism on the Darwinian Hypothesis, which will flutter the strict Darwinians considerably. I have for some time contemplated this, but was arrested in my intention by his death, which made the writing of such a criticism undesirable for a time. It will probably be a year before I fulfil the intention.

After two weeks at Standish, where he had "plenty of out-door games—lawn tennis, bowls, and quoits—with billiards in the evening," he told Miss Beatrice Potter:—"The game-cure joined with other agencies has done much, and as I was saying at the Huxleys' yesterday, if

[1] About New Zealand Mr. Collier informed him "that a range of mountains in Nelson province bears, and for twenty years has borne, your name." He had heard from Lady Dalhousie that his books were much read in New Zealand, "although," she added, "as Dalhousie remarked, there is no country where your teaching is less acted upon."

I were a young man and a speculator, I would set up an establishment to treat patients by it.''

To E. L. Youmans.

September, 1883.

I have now to break off this [the *Autobiography*] for the purpose of preparing a second edition of '' Ceremonial Institutions.'' Some alterations in the plates are needful, for I have to tackle Tylor's criticisms, or rather his elaborate attack on me, which was given as a lecture at the Royal Institution, and published in *Macmillan* [May, 1882]. One only of his criticisms is, I think, valid.[1]

3 *October*.—We are on the highway to Communism, and I see no likelihood that the movement in that direction will be arrested. Contrariwise, it seems to me that every new step makes more difficult any reversal; since the re-active portion of the public seems likely to become weaker and weaker.

13 *November*.—I shall probably commit myself to a series of four political articles. For some time past I have been getting more and more exasperated at the way in which things are drifting towards Communism, with increasing velocity; and though I fear little is to be done I am prompted to make a vehement protest, and am intending to say some very strong things. Oddly enough, yesterday while exciting myself over it, as I have been doing lately, the editor of the *Contemporary Review* called on me, wanting me to take up the question, which has just been raised in a very startling way by an article of Lord Salisbury's on the dwellings of the industrial classes. Though I have not yet committed myself I shall probably do so. Of course I do not like to suspend other work, but the matter is pressing and important, and, in

[1] *Principles of Sociology*, ii., 81.

a sense, permanent; for, these four articles I contemplate, dealing with the questions not after a temporary, but after a permanent manner, will have their future value.

12 *January.*—The programme of the forthcoming number of the *Edinburgh* I see contains an article on "The Spencerian Philosophy." I expect it will be civilly dissentient.

28 *January.*—I went yesterday to look at the article to find a sentence which would serve my purpose, and found one on the last page admirably fitted, which I enclose. I am going this week to issue advertisements of *First Principles* in all the leading papers, to which I shall fix this adverse opinion of the *Edinburgh* by way of showing my contempt for it.

The advertisement accordingly appeared with the selected sentence: "This is nothing but a Philosophy of epithets and phrases, introduced and carried on with an unrivalled solemnity and affectation of precision of style, concealing the loosest reasoning and the haziest indefiniteness." A copy was sent "to the editor and another to the contributor, who, I find, is Sir Edward Beckett."

The entry in the diary for New Year's Day, 1884, was a bad omen: "Had to decline dining at Huxley's New Year's Day dinner—feared effects." "Resumed the practice which I began before Christmas, of going to Kensal Green every morning and playing quoits, at intervals between games getting some work done and deriving benefit." The work done under this "eccentric arrangement," was the writing of the political articles: the benefit was of a mixed kind. Playing quoits in January, with intervals of dictation, had a result that might have been looked for—an attack of lumbago. This

was no sooner got rid of than he reverted to quoits, and was again incapacitated. After a time he was saved the drive to Kensal Green through the kindness of Mr. George Howard, M.P., who gave him the use of a field in Palace Gardens. Spencer "arranged with the lodge-keeper for a room in which to work between games—good little room with fire." So runs the diary, in the keeping of which, be it noted, he was getting to be extremely lax. The "game cure," carried out in these more favourable conditions, hardly had a fair chance before it was given up in favour of an opposite regimen. On his return from a second visit to Brighton, he adopted the course of driving daily to the Athenæum and back all the way in a cab; thus taking no exercise and avoiding exposure. "*I greatly improved*" (the italics are his own).

To E. L. Youmans.

15 *February*, 1884.

"The New Toryism" [the first of the four political articles] has caused a considerable sensation here, and has brought a hornet's nest about my ears in the shape of criticisms from the liberal journals . . . most of which make fun of me. Oddly enough I am patted on the back by the conservatives, which is a new experience for me; and by the Roman Catholic organ, the *Tablet*. It is droll to see that whereas a few weeks ago the article on Religion was by it labelled "Dangerous," "the New Toryism" is quoted from with approbation. I am well forward with the third article, which will astonish people still more than the previous ones.

On the retirement of Mr. P. A. Taylor from the representation of Leicester in Parliament, Spencer was asked

to allow his name to be put forward as a candidate. His mind having been for many years made up on the question of entering Parliament, there was no need to deliberate on the answer, which was in fact given the day following.

To Rev. J. Page Hopps.

21 *February*, 1884.

While I am gratified by the compliment, and by the manifestation of sympathy, implied in your proposal, I fear that I cannot respond to it in the way you wish. Several reasons, each of them sufficient, deter me.

In the first place, my health is such that discharge of Parliamentary duties would be impossible. . . . The labours implied by active political life, could I bear them, would make it impossible for me to do other work. As I regard such other work as by far the more important—as I think I can do more good by endeavouring to complete what I have undertaken than by occupying myself in listening to debates and giving votes; I should not feel that I was doing right in exchanging the one career for the other.

Far too high an estimate is, I think, made of the influence possessed in our day by a member of Parliament. Now that he has come to be, much more than in past times, subject to his constituents—now that the House of Commons as a whole is more and more obliged to subordinate itself to public opinion—the implication is that those who form public opinion are those who really exercise power. It is becoming a common remark that we are approaching a state in which laws are practically made out of doors, and simply registered by Parliament; and if so, then the actual work of legislation is more the work of those who modify the ideas of electors than of those who give effect to their ideas. So regarding the matter, I conceive that I should not gain influence, but rather lose influence, by ceasing to be a writer that I might become a representative.

But, apart from these general reasons, there is the more special reason that, if chosen by the electors of Leicester, I should prove a very impracticable member. My views on political matters are widely divergent from those of all political parties at present existing. That which I hold to be the chief business of legislation—an administration of justice such as shall secure to each person, with certainty and without cost, the maintenance of his equitable claims—is a business to which little attention is paid; while attention is absorbed in doing things which I hold should not be done at all. As I could not agree to be merely a delegate, voting as was desired by those who sent me, but should have in all cases to act on my own judgment, I should be in continual antagonism with my constituents; most of whom, Liberal as well as Conservative, hold opinions from which I dissent, and who would wish me to support measures which I entirely disapproved of. Hence, even if elected, I should be quickly called upon to resign.

Nor have I even now enumerated all my reasons. There is a further one, which many will doubtless think more anomalous than the last. Not only should I object to the oath required on taking my seat, if elected, but I should object to make even the affirmation, were that allowed in place of it. Neither constituents nor their representatives appear at present to recognise any impropriety in being bound by the judgments of remote ancestors. They are quite ready to bind themselves not to change certain institutions which their great-great-great &c., grandfathers decided would be good for them. Were I called upon to make such a promise I should refuse to do so; holding myself free, as I should, to seek the change or abolition of such institutions if I did not think them beneficial. Quite irrespective of any opinion concerning the particular things to which the promise bound me, I should object on principle to being bound at all.

You will thus see that the choice of me as a candidate

would be extremely impolitic, even had I no reasons of a personal kind for declining to stand.

The letter was published with the omission of the paragraph about the oath. There was a widely-expressed opinion that philosophers had not proved a success in the House of Commons, and a general agreement in thinking it of more importance that Spencer should continue his work than that he should enter Parliament. The soundness of his own characterisation of himself as "a very impracticable member" was questioned by few. Curiously enough, about the time Spencer declined a proffered seat in the House of Commons, Lord Tennyson took his seat in the House of Lords. As one newspaper said: "We have secured our poet, but not our philosopher."

To E. L. Youmans.

14 *March*, 1884.

There is quite a chorus of comment on my letter, and nearly all of it is favourable. . . . To-day the *Times*, *Spectator*, and *Saturday Review* have leaders, particularly dissentient. I will send you that of the *Times* in a day or two along with my reply to it.

20 *March*.—I did not, as I thought of doing, write a letter to the *Times* showing what I conceived to be the fallacy of the inference drawn in their article that costless administration of justice would immensely increase litigation, and arguing that were justice prompt, certain and costless, the result would be not increase but decrease; since the larger amount of civil aggression results from the belief that it will not bring any penalty. My reason for changing my intention was that controversy with an editor is a bootless business and is sure

to end unpleasantly; since he has the advantage of stopping discussion when he pleases, and is sure to leave one apparently in the wrong.

An invitation to join the Liberty and Property Defence League was declined for reasons stated in the following letter:—

To the Earl of Wemyss.

1 *March*, 1884.

Were there none but the immediate issues to be considered, I should have pleasure in yielding to your request, but there are remoter issues, and consideration of these deters me.

I think it would be politic neither for the League nor for myself that I should join it. Rightly or wrongly it has acquired the repute of a Tory organisation; and as I have recently been exasperating the Liberal party by my criticisms, were I to join the League the inference which would be drawn, and apparently with very good ground, would be that I had turned tail. Now were this inference to be drawn and widely asserted as it would be, such effect as may be presently produced by papers I am now writing would be in large measure destroyed. The press of the Liberal party would have a seemingly valid reason for pooh-poohing all that I say.

Not only would this be a result I should greatly regret, alike on public and private grounds, but, as I have implied, in so far as it would tend to diminish what influence these forthcoming papers may have on the development of individualistic ideas and feelings, it would tell against the progress of the League, by causing men to turn a deaf ear to arguments against the meddling policy, which they would otherwise listen to.

The letters to New York about this time are concerned mainly with the political articles and the con-

troversies arising out of the article on "Religious Retrospect and Prospect." Here are some of the references to the former:—

To E. L. Youmans.

15 *April*, 1884.

The remaining article ["The Great Political Superstition"] . . . is altogether revolutionary in its view, and will greatly astound people, perhaps even more in America than in England, since its essential principle is the denial of the right of the majority save within certain definable limits. The argument is working out even more satisfactorily than I expected; and the whole politico-ethical theory is presenting itself in a more complete and harmonious form than I ever before perceived it could have. . . . It is amusing to find myself patted on the back by the Tory papers. Had I been asked in times gone by whether such a thing could have happened I should have regarded it as quite impossible.

13 *May*.—This [the last of the articles—"The Great Political Superstition"] will, I think, end what I have to say about political matters. Beginning in 1842 and returning from time to time to the topic in the interval, with further developments, I now in 1884 reach what seems to me a sufficiently completed view—the politico-ethical doctrine set forth in this article being a presentation in a finished form of the theory gradually developed during these forty-two years. It will, I think, eventually form a new departure in politics. The definite conclusions reached, alike concerning the legitimate powers of Governments and majorities, and the reason why, beyond a certain range, their powers cannot be legitimately exercised, and along with them the definite conception presented of the nature of true Liberalism for the future, may, I think, serve presently to give a positive creed for an advanced party in politics. At any rate, I have

now done all that I can to make the matter clear; and what little energy remains I shall, I think, in future devote wholly in other directions. [He was disappointed with the reception accorded to the paper on "The Sins of Legislators," which had at first been intended to form part of the final paper.] A reason for dividing it was that I was anxious not to distract attention from the special group of facts it contained, showing that legislation was to blame for the immense evils that have, during the last six months, been a current topic—the evils set forth in the Bitter Cry of the Outcasts of London. I thought that the exposure of the causes of these evils would create a considerable sensation; but one is habitually wrong in these cases. Next to nothing has been said about the fact that the whole mischief is of governmental production. I suppose in part it may be that the facts tell alike against both political parties; and neither party consequently likes to say anything about them.

15 *May*.—The *Pall Mall Gazette*, which has taken the lead in emulating the American papers in introducing "interviewing," is apparently inclined to emulate them in unscrupulousness. The enclosed verses will show you what amount of conscience exists among journalistic leaders of opinion over here. . . .[1]

> "Let Evolution fight its destined fight
> Unchecked through Competition's strain and stress."

But there is a great demoralisation in public life here. I could never have believed that in our day political parties, and more particularly the Tories [the Liberals afterwards behaved as ill or worse. H. S.[2]] would have behaved so vilely as they have done. I am beginning to feel a certain satisfaction in the thought that I shall soon be out of it all, and leave no posterity.

---

[1] *Pall Mall Gazette*, 14 May, 1884, "Laissez Faire!—A Sermon in Spencerian Stanzas."

[2] Inserted by Spencer at a later period in a copy of the letter left among his papers.

All through July, 1884, he was busy seeing through the press the political articles, under the title—*The Man* versus *the State*. A bust for which he had given sittings to Mr. Boehm in 1883, and replicas of which he was now presenting to his more intimate friends, furnished some distraction from the engrossing topics of politics and religion.

To E. L. Youmans.

6 *October*, 1884.

I am glad that you are pleased with the bust. It has been by most thought very good, though not by all. The Huxley family are pretty unanimous in their condemnation—Mrs. Huxley going so far as to say that she should like to take a hammer and smash it. One remark of theirs was that there was a want of character in it, and John Collier (the son-in-law) said that it looked more like the portrait of a speaker than a thinker. I incline to think that there is some truth in the remark made by Westmacott, a member of the Athenæum and the son of the sculptor, who said to me that he thought it was too incisive. However, Boehm has a marble bust, which I commissioned him to do for me, in hand, and I may perhaps get him to somewhat soften down this undue salience of traits.

14 *November*.—Having got rid of all my controversial botheration, I am now making preparations to go on with permanent work again quietly. . . . I should already have made some way with "Ecclesiastical Institutions" had it not been for the considerable amount of trouble consequent upon another piece of work [the revision of the first volume of the *Sociology*]. . . . I am at the same time, while erasing some superfluous illustrations, adding here and there others; especially in chapters dealing with disputed questions—the chapter

on Animal Worship, and that on Nature Worship, both of which are greatly strengthened.

At the beginning of 1885 he thought he had now entered upon smooth waters, and would speedily reach his next port. Little did he foresee the storm to be raised over the republication in the United States of the controversy with Mr. Frederic Harrison, nor had past experience taught him to make allowance for the many uncertain currents which might cause him to drift from his prescribed course, now in one direction, now in another. One of these side currents was due to Rev. T. Mozley's *Reminiscences*.[1] Another arose out of Mr. Martineau's new book, Spencer being dissatisfied with the distinction drawn between his own and Mr. Darwin's presentation of the principle of evolution.[2]

To E. L. Youmans.

23 *March*, 1885.

I hope you will be getting your breathing apparatus into better order down south. Why have you not let me know something of the results of the change? I daresay you find it difficult to kill time away from your work; but this is better than to let time kill you while at your work, as you will inevitably soon do if you go on without taking constant and great precautions. . . .

The Belgian economist M. Emile de Laveleye has written an article in the *Contemporary Review* under the title of "The State *versus* the Man, a reply to Herbert Spencer." The editor brought to me a proof the other day with the implication that I might say something in reply.

[1] *Autobiography*, i., 49, Appendix K., p. 645.
[2] *Types of Ethical Theory*, ii., 344.

The following is from M. de Laveleye after seeing Spencer's reply.

From Emile de Laveleye.

Liege, 2 *April*, 1885.

I think the one really important point in our dissent is your opinion, borrowed from orthodox economy, that, under existing conditions, if free contract were but established, labour would be equitably remunerated. I maintain what you demonstrate in your *Social Statics* (chap. ix.) that when primary rights are violated, *i.e.*, when the labourer or the tenant, deprived of all property, is forced to choose between the wages offered him by his employer or the owner of the land and starvation, he is no more free than the traveller when requested to deliver up his money or his life.

To E. L. Youmans.

4 *May*, 1885.

I presume that you have seen Dr. McCosh's criticism on me. . . . The criticism, in parts which I have looked at, is of the loosest, and almost, in some cases, puerile kind. He has been justifying the name which was given to him in Scotland—Dr. McBosh.

21 *July*.—I have finished "Ecclesiastical Institutions" . . . and I shall take the whole of the remainder of the manuscript to the printer on Thursday before leaving town, which I do on Friday morning. After ten days or a fortnight with my friends the Potters, on the banks of Windermere, I shall probably go north, and try to get some fishing, as well as some bracing air in Sutherlandshire. Probably I shall be back about the beginning of September, or soon after.

31 *August*.—The result of my excursion to Scotland was disastrous instead of beneficial. Wear and tear of

travelling, joined with some over-exertion the next day, knocked me down utterly—so utterly that I had to return home; and not daring to undertake the worry of travelling by myself, had to telegraph to London for Mr. Hudson [his new Secretary] to come and take charge of me. However, by taking the journey home in short stages, and stopping here and there for a few days, I have got back greatly improved, and am now not so much below par as I expected to be.

30 *September.*—What little I am now doing is devoted to the Essay, or rather Essays, which I named to you, in criticism of the Darwinian view. It is growing greatly in importance as I collect memoranda and material, and will, I think, tend to put a different aspect upon the whole question, which has at present been considered very partially. The Essays will I think produce some sensation, or even among some, consternation.

The new edition of the first volume of the *Sociology* was published soon after his return from Scotland; and by the beginning of October *Ecclesiastical Institutions* was ready. He at once began the *Factors of Organic Evolution.* As setting forth his relation to Mr. Darwin, Mr. Grant Allen's little book, *Charles Darwin,* was opportune, as well as welcome.[1]

The necessity of husbanding his energies was in itself sufficient reason for declining the presidentship of "The Sunday Society" in succession to the Duke of Westminster, as well as requests from Hull and Cork to lecture. Following on correspondence with Lord Dysart on Home Rule, a letter was sent to the *Times* on "Government by Minority," protesting against allowing the Irish Party in the House of Commons, by a

[1] *Memoir of Grant Allen,* p. 126.

system of organised obstruction, to stop all legislation until Home Rule had been granted. "Hitherto I have never said anything about the politics of the day," he told Dr. Youmans, "but I felt prompted to do so on this occasion. You will see that the leading article refers to the letter; and the editor of the *Quarterly* yesterday told me that he had cut it out and sent it to one of his contributors, who was writing a political article; so that the hour spent in writing it was not thrown away." A request from the Hon. Auberon Herbert for a brief summary of his attitude about the land, led to the writing of the following letter, a copy of which he came upon during the controversy on the land question in 1890.[1]

To the Hon. Auberon Herbert.

13 *October,* 1885.

The views on land tenure set forth in *Social Statics* five and thirty years ago, were purely ethical in their derivation, and belonged to a system of what I have called absolute ethics, in contradistinction to that relative ethics which takes into account existing arrangements and existing men. When writing them I had no conception that the question of State-ownership would be raised in our time, or in any time near at hand; but had in thought a distant future when a better adaptation of human nature to social life had arisen, and purely equitable social arrangements had become practicable.

The conclusion reached was forced on me partly when seeking a valid basis for private property (the ordinary basis alleged by Locke and others being invalid), and finding none that was satisfactory save one originating in contract between the individual as tenant and the

[1] *Infra,* chap. xxii.

community as land owner, and it was partly forced on me by the contemplation of such anomalies as that which we see in the Scilly Islands, the owner of which may, if he pleases, make residence in them conditional on accepting his own religious creed, and conforming to any modes of life he dictates; a state of things which ethically considered is indefensible.

That any economic advantage would be gained by such a change as that indicated is not obvious. All that can be said to belong by right to the community is the land in its original uncleared, unfertilised state. The value given to it during centuries of cultivation, which (excluding town lands) is nearly all its value, belongs to the existing proprietors; nearly all of whom have either themselves paid for that artificial value, or are the representatives of those who did. The equivalent of this value would, of course, have to be given in compensation if the land were resumed by the community; and the interest on the required purchase money would, at present rates, absorb as much as, or more than, the community would receive in the shape of rent from its tenants.

Moreover, there is the difficulty that administration of landed property by the State, would be bad administration, economically considered; since there is no reason to suppose that public machinery would work better in the land-managing department than in any other department. Whether future increments of increased value, which would accrue to the public, would compensate for the loss caused by inferiority of administration may be doubted.

As will be seen by any one who reads the chapter on property in "Political Institutions," my views respecting land tenure are by no means settled—there being a difficulty, out of which I do not see my way, in reconciling the ethical view with the economical view.

But as is shown in the last lines of the chapter, I regard communal proprietorship of land, if established

at all, as a system to be established when the industrial type has reached its full development; and I am distinctly opposed to the question being raised at present, because it is clear that any such change, if made, would be made in the interests of Communism.

A note of sadness pervades the letters to Dr. Youmans and Mr. Lott towards the end of the year. To the former he writes: "The fact is we are all beginning to break up in one way or other. Of the members of the X Club, which, in Huxley's phrase, reached 'its majority' yesterday, one is gone, and of the remaining eight, there are only two in good health. My poor friend Lott is in a bad way."

To Edward Lott.

10 *November,* 1885.

Your letter has made me sad on various accounts—more especially of course on your own. . . . On my own account also it was a disappointment. For I had been cogitating over a scheme for taking a house on the South Coast in some salubrious place . . . where I might come at intervals and spend perhaps a third of the year with you. . . . As it is, however, it is obvious that migration from Derby is out of the question for you; so that my plan, from which I hoped all of us would benefit, is knocked on the head.

By a fortunate coincidence it happens that I am just revising my will, and perhaps it may not be amiss to say that I have left £300 to you, or to Phy [Mr. Lott's daughter] if you die before me. This may serve slightly to diminish your anxieties on her behalf.

Being at Brighton he could not attend the X dinner of 3rd December. Professor Huxley wrote next day.

We were very sorry to miss you yesterday—were reduced to five; but we contrived to keep our spirits up and positively sat till after ten o'clock—all except Lubbock who had to go to the Linnæan. I don't think that anything of a very profound character was said—in fact, in your absence, I am afraid we inclined to frivolity.

To T. H. Huxley.

7 December, 1885.

And so you sat till 10. Well, really, this is too bad. Considering that I am always the one to protest against the early dissolutions that habitually take place, that you should seize the occasion of my absence for making a night of it, is adding insult to injury. It would really seem from the fact which you deliberately bring before me, that I have hitherto been the cause of the prompt breakings up of the party! I shall have to bring the question before the next X, and ask what it is in my behaviour which leads to this obvious anxiety to get away as soon as possible when I am present.

I am very glad to hear of Lord Iddesleigh's letter, and the intimation conveyed in it. It is an immense point in life to have no anxieties about resources; and now that you are free from these and all official cares of moment, we may look for a good deal of original work, joined with bouts of fighting, the occurrence of which goes without saying.

I got hold of the *Nineteenth Century* [for December] as soon as it made its appearance here, and chuckled over the article;[1] which, as usual, exemplifies the hand of iron in the glove of velvet.

Acting on a suggestion of Mr. Howard Collins, the Sociological Section of the Birmingham Natural History Society proposed to prepare indexes to Spencer's books

[1] "The Interpreters of Genesis and the Interpreters of Nature."

—a proposal which was gladly accepted. As far as the carrying out of this proposal was concerned, that happened which usually happens when a duty is undertaken by several—the work before long lay entirely upon the shoulders of one man. Even such assistance in the way of criticism and suggestion as Mr. Collins had looked for from Spencer was not forthcoming. Former offers to index his books, made by the present writer and others, had not been taken advantage of "for the reason that all these things entail upon me business of one kind or other, and my energies are so narrow and are so continually being frittered away by letter-writing and transactions with printers, &c., that I get scarcely any work done."

CHAPTER XVIII

RELIGIOUS DISCUSSION: A SUPPRESSED BOOK

(*March,* 1883—*December,* 1885)

In the foregoing chapter we have seen how Spencer thought he had arrived after forty-two years of meditation within sight of "a positive creed for an advanced party in politics." In the chapter we are now entering upon we shall be concerned mainly with what he intended to be "a kind of final expression" of his views on religion. Though the events about to be narrated coincided in point of time with those set forth in the last chapter, they have a special interest of their own which justifies a separate chapter being devoted to them.

To E. L. Youmans.

12 *April,* 1883.

I have just finished the first chapter of "Ecclesiastical Institutions." It deals generally with the religious idea, beginning by showing that it does not exist naturally, that there is no such intuition as theologians tell us, and then goes on to recapitulate in another form and briefly, with fresh illustrations, the argument elaborated in the first volume, winding up by drawing a detailed parallel between the origin and evolution of the present creed and those of other creeds, and showing how complete is their correspondence. It is dreadfully destructive.

Writing to Miss Beatrice Potter (October 8) he says: "If you should some day get hold of a book just pub-

lished by a clergyman, the Rev. W. D. Ground, *An Examination of the Structural Principles of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Philosophy,* you will be astonished to find it suggested that I am very possibly 'called' to reconstruct the Church of Christ!!!"

To Rev. W. D. Ground.

12 *October,* 1883.

To meet with a work, which, like yours, deals with the doctrine of the Synthetic Philosophy as a whole, and with an obvious desire to deal justly, affords me pleasure. I quite agree with your statement that the general doctrine of Evolution is independent of these ontological views which I have associated with it; and I am not sorry to have this fact insisted upon. . . . I may, however, draw your attention to certain passages, the full meaning of which I think you do not recognise, concerning the view I hold respecting the Ultimate Power.

In March, 1885, he drew the attention of Dr. Youmans to the work of another clerical author with similar aims.

There has just been published here a book entitled *Can the Old Faith live with the New?* by the Rev. George Matheson, D.D.—evidently a Scotch presbyterian, for he dates from Inellan, on the Firth of Clyde. It is a very remarkable book, having a drift something like that of Ground's book, but written in a way which will I think be more attractive to the mass and more appreciable. It is really a very clever attempt to show that the evolution doctrine is not irreconcilable with the current creed, . . . I should think Beecher would rejoice over it and take its doctrines as texts.

During 1883 little progress was made with *Ecclesiastical Institutions.* For months, however, he had been

thinking over the concluding chapter, and in the autumn this was written and put in type, proofs being sent to Professors Huxley and Tyndall in November. Six months were to be allowed them for perusal and criticism; but within a day or two he changed his mind and decided on immediate publication. Hence a note to each of them with the remark: "It is absurd after giving you six months, to want your criticisms in as many days."

To E. L. Youmans.

13 *November,* 1883.

I enclose you a proof of a chapter entitled "Religious Retrospect and Prospect," which is the closing chapter of my next division, "Ecclesiastical Institutions." I began to write it in advance of the others some time during the summer and only recently finished it: the reason why I thus began having been at first simply that it was one I could dictate out of doors, because it did not involve reference to collections of materials. Having written it thus in advance, I thought it well a short time since to have it set up in type, so that it might be well considered and subject to the criticisms of friends before publication, seeing that it is a kind of final expression of my opinion; and I lately sent copies to Huxley and Tyndall.

As implied, my intention was until recently to reserve it until all the other chapters of the Part were written, and then to let it appear for the first time along with the new volume. . . . Within this day or two, however, on re-thinking over the matter I have come to the conclusion that the advantages of immediate publication are such as to more than counterweigh this consideration. In the first place, it is a long time since I have made any sign, and it is important to publish something. In the second place, the chapter, if published separately here and with you, will be far more

widely diffused than if it were reserved for the volume and limited to the circulation that would attain. In the third place, the question is a burning one, and one in respect of which it is desirable to be clearly understood.

17 *November.*—Knowles is going to publish this "Religious Retrospect and Prospect" in the *Nineteenth Century.* Hitherto he has always made the simultaneous publication in America a ground for refusal. But, as I wished to have the widest diffusion for the article here, I wrote to him asking whether he still maintained his interdict, telling him that simultaneous publication in America is a *sine quâ non* and that I must go elsewhere if he did not assent. He replied, the temptation is too great and he would yield.

22 *November.*—If this reaches you in time, please insert the note I enclose. It is to meet a possible criticism pointed out by Huxley.[1] Huxley has read the article twice and Tyndall three times, and both coincide. So that the argument may be taken as an expression of advanced scientific opinion.

19 *January,* 1884.—It is curious to hear that the American press has so generally shied at the article. . . . Here there has been a considerable amount of attention. . . . And various papers have been sent to me containing articles, mostly expressing interest, and in some cases "pain and disgust." There is, however, a marked absence of the bitterness which characterised such notices in years gone by. Knowles tells me that he had had quite a hailstorm of communications about it, some being from clergymen who declined to take the *Nineteenth Century* any longer; and he tells me that Gladstone had a letter asking him how he could con-

[1] *Principles of Sociology,* iii., 166, note.

tribute to a periodical which contained such an article. I also have had a great many letters and books; aiming to show me the error of my ways, but all without ill-temper.

Proofs of the article had been sent to France, Germany, Italy, Hungary, Russia, India and Japan, as well as to New Zealand, where Sir George Grey took steps to have it published without loss of time, wishing "that an independent public opinion should be formed on it before people would have had their judgments interfered with by the articles from Europe." In Australia, Mr. Caddy, one of Spencer's disciples, had great difficulty in getting an editor to look at it; one of them saying "that he could not print Mr. Spencer's wild speculations in a paper which every week supplied one of Spurgeon's sermons." Of America Dr. Youmans had to admit: "Evidently there is more religious independence of thought in England than here. For your critics, at any rate, take interest in the subject, while there is too much timidity here to venture upon either side of the discussion."

Meanwhile, the storm was beginning to gather, though as yet the cloud was no bigger than a man's hand. Mr. Frederic Harrison's article on "The Ghost of a Religion" appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* for March.

To E. L. Youmans.

6 *March*, 1884.

You see Harrison is aiming to turn my article on Religion to account in furtherance of the worship of Humanity. It is rather droll to see how, considering he sets out with the statement that he is not about to criticise my argument, he should end by what is practically

a ferocious assault upon it. I suppose I ought to answer him; but, if so, [I] must postpone it until these political articles are out of hand.

I feel prompted to answer him not only because he quite mistakes my view, besides making sundry other statements of a baseless kind, but also because I feel inclined now to make a trenchant criticism on the religion of Humanity. As I think I told you I intended years ago to do this, and it was to form part of the article on "Religion: a Retrospect and Prospect," which I have published. But . . . I thought on the whole it might be well not to arouse the animosity of the Positivists. Now, however, that Harrison's article practically challenges me, I feel very much inclined to have my say in the matter. What do you think?

14 *June*.—Herewith I send you proof of the article on "Retrogressive Religion" which is my reply to Harrison, and in part as you will see by its last section, to the more recent attack of Sir James Stephen. . . .[1]

[It had not at first been his intention to hasten the reply.] When, however, there came out on the first of the month Sir James Stephen's criticisms on Harrison and myself, and when at the same time there was published a kindred attack in the *National Review* by Mr. Wilfred Ward,[2] (which I have not yet seen, but which is referred to in the press, and especially in an article in the *Saturday* called "A Quadrangular Duel,")[3] it seemed to me that it would not do to postpone longer the publication of my reply.

22 *July*.—I am glad you like the "Retrogressive Religion." It has done considerable service here, especially in making people understand better what the Agnostic attitude is. It is rather amusing to find myself

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, June. [2] *National Review*, June.
[3] *Saturday Review*, 7 June.

patted on the back by sundry of the religious papers, as I have been—Church, Roman Catholic, and Dissenters. It will doubtless be serviceable in the same way with you.

Harrison has a reply in hand, but I gather that it is not likely to appear on August 1.

The controversy was viewed with concern by one, at least, of the Positivists.

From Richard Congreve.

9 *July,* 1884.

I have not read either the attack on you or your reply in the *Nineteenth Century,* which, I hear, is a strong attack on our religious system. But I hear also that you express yourself as not having wished to make that attack, but rather, from a friendly feeling, personally to have wished to put by your objection. In response to that friendly feeling, (I write, as you see, on hearsay), I wish to say that I regret the attack made on you. Better quietly work out our own work and leave it to time for the decision between them. I have no faith in such discussion on the highest subject of human interest. . . . May I add that for another reason I regret anything which tends to alienate you. Your utterances on social and, especially imperial, questions have been of a nature to obscure other differences between us.

He left for Scotland on August 1, having as his guests Miss Lott and her cousin, Miss Glover. After a few days at Kinloch Rannoch, they went by Kingussie and Fort William to Oban. London was reached early in September.

To E. L. Youmans.

9 *September,* 1884.

I inclose you something which will, I think, make you rub your hands and laugh. Harrison, evidently made

revengeful by my treatment of the Religion of Humanity, has seized the occasion of the anniversary of Comte's death to deliver an address which he has sent to the daily papers. . . . I inclose a report of his address, as well as my own reply. [*Times* and *Standard*, 9 September.] Never was a man more completely "hoist with his own petard." He intended to do me an immense mischief; instead of which he has done an immense mischief to himself and an immense benefit to me.

You will see that he has given me an occasion for bringing out incidentally, and quite naturally, a correction of the current notion respecting my relations to Darwin; that he has afforded me the opportunity of giving an account of the genesis of the Synthetic Philosophy; and further, that he has enabled me to publish Mill's testimony, which I could not otherwise have published. . . . Nothing more fortunate for me in the shape of rectification of errors could, indeed, have happened.

15 *September*.—Herewith I enclose you a second letter published this morning in the *Times* and the *Standard* in reply to a skilfully written letter of Harrison's.

I send it partly because you will be interested, and partly because you may find use for the second part of it, which gives a brief sketch of the origin and nature of the Synthetic Philosophy. This will serve to give people in small space a dim conception how the thing originated and what it is as a whole. It is a further piece of good fortune; since it enables me to circulate among multitudes of people a general notion which would otherwise never reach them.

FROM RICHARD POTTER.

15 *September*, 1884.

I have just read your letter in to-day's *Times* and *Standard*. I congratulate you upon a complete success.

You have proved your case, and, better than that, you have conquered your adversary by superior temper and by perfect courtesy. . . .

Don't give him any further notice. . . . If you add magnanimity to courtesy your victory is still more conspicuous. Now, you know full well, that I am a disinterested spectator and not a partisan of either Philosophy. I have a powerful affection for you and none for Harrison, and I have a deep interest in your good name and happiness, but am not one of the disciples or believers in your Philosophy, nor in Comtism either. I am unable to accept either the one or the other as a substitute for the Christianity which I have been reared in.

Like several others, Dr. Youmans feared that the controversy as to his relation to Comte, coming as it did before the discussion on religion had died away, was going to cost too much, however advantageous it might be in some respects.

To E. L. Youmans.

6 *October,* 1884.

The Harrison business, as you say, has been a sad loss of time, and I almost regret having said anything about it. . . . However, the thing is over now. . . .

The result of this second controversy on the back of the other, was that I was so far delayed in completing the article for the *Nineteenth Century* that it did not make its appearance this month. . . . The whole matter will in so far as I am concerned (and I think also in so far as Harrison is concerned) be ended by this next article.

The second controversy, affording as it did an opportunity for giving an outline of the nature and origin of the Synthetic Philosophy, suggested the expediency of

publishing the portion of the *Autobiography* dealing with his education and with the various steps that led eventually to the conception of evolution. The letter proceeds to weigh the reasons for and against present publication.

I feel more and more the difficulty of publishing the thing during my own life. . . . And yet on the other hand . . . there are such strong reasons for not delaying the publication of the essential parts until after my death. There is first of all the educational effect. Now that the pestilent cramming system and the pestilent mechanical methods are becoming more and more organised and made universal by our State-system, which threatens to include all classes and put everybody under inspection, I feel more and more the importance of placing before people a picture of the opposite system and its effects; and it seems to be a pity that the publication of such evidence as might modify their views should be postponed perhaps ten or fifteen years until I am gone. And then there is the better understanding of the general doctrine of Evolution which would result from placing its successive stages of growth before people in the biographical form. . . . So that apart from the rectification of erroneous conceptions respecting supposed relations to Darwin and Comte, I feel that there are strong reasons for not delaying. And yet on the other hand, as I say, I neither feel that I can properly suspend other work, nor can I with satisfaction to myself publish a full Autobiography.

30 *October*.—In a day or two I shall send you a copy of the pamphlet I am re-issuing—"Reasons for dissenting from the philosophy of M. Comte." Under existing circumstances I have thought well to detach this from the Essay on Classification. . . . Now that I have got through all my fights and worries—for my last words

with Harrison are coming out in the *Nineteenth Century* just about to be issued—I am hopeful of being able to set to on my permanent work with tolerable vigour. I shall rejoice to get to it, for it has been standing idle and I am weary of distractions.

From E. L. Youmans.

11 *November*, 1884.

In regard to the Harrison controversy and his forthcoming book, it seems to me that your policy is to entirely ignore it from this time on. . . . I recognise the force of all you say respecting the desirableness of bringing out the full account of the genesis of the Evolution Philosophy, and to reinforce those views of education to which present tendencies give undoubted importance. Yet I think no question of a few years' advantage should be allowed a feather's weight against the far greater advantages of developing as far as possible, your main work. . . .

Every further step in the exposition of the Synthetic Philosophy will be a permanent gain to the world, and transient considerations should not be allowed to interfere with it.

To E. L. Youmans.

3 *January*, 1885.

I find lying for me the last number of the *Popular Science Monthly*. You make a telling presentation of the question between Harrison and myself; as usual, seizing the essential points very clearly. . . .

I enclose a leaf from the *Journal of Education* containing a paragraph which will amuse you.[1]

[1] This referred to the award of a prize given by the Journal "for the best list of the seven greatest living English Educationists." Spencer heads the list to which the prize was awarded. He also had the highest number of votes, Professor Bain being next.

13 *January.*—The long interval since I heard from you leads me to fear that you are ill, or at any rate suffering seriously from the cold weather. Pray go South. If it is a question of money, take possession of the half year's balance due to me. I do not want it.

On the same day the anxiously looked for letter came. In it Dr. Youmans broached the question of the republication of the controversy with Harrison.

From E. L. Youmans.

2 *January,* 1885.

And now we have something of a new embarrassment upon which I must consult you. There is a pretty sharp demand for the publication of your controversy with Harrison in a separate form, and the publishers favour it. The question is not simply whether it is desirable, for we cannot control it. There is danger that it will be done by others, and if that should occur it would be construed as a triumph of the Harrison party—the Spencerians having declined to go into it.

If I thought no one else would print the correspondence I should be in favour of our not doing it. In the first place, for general effect Rhetoric against Reason counts as about ten to one. The Comtists are reviving —Harrison is coming over to lecture in this country, and much will be made of his brilliant conduct of the controversy. In the next place, he has this advantage of you. Your main work bearing upon the issue is to be sought elsewhere, while Harrison had accumulated all the materials of his assault and gives his whole case, so that the popular effect could not fail to be much in his favour. To the narrower circle of readers, who can really appreciate the discussion, the republication would undoubtedly be an excellent thing, and I suppose after all it is only these that we should much care for. On

the whole it may be politic to reprint—What do you think about it?

To E. L. Youmans.

14 *January*, 1885.

After sending you off my note yesterday in some anxiety about your state, I was glad to get a letter from you this morning which relieved me a little, though not fully, for it appears that the winter is telling upon you, if not in a renewed pulmonary attack, still in other ways.

Why will you, against your better knowledge, yield to this American mania of sacrificing yourself in trying to do more work? You accept in theory the gospel of relaxation; why can you not act upon it? What is the use of both abridging life, and making it full of physical miseries, all in the hope of achieving a little more; and eventually being baulked of your hope by the very eagerness to achieve? You have done quite enough already in the way of working for the public good. Pay a little regard to yourself and let things drift. . . . Excuse my plain speaking, but it is grievous to me to see you deliberately killing yourself.

I quite agree to the reprinting of the Harrison controversy. I have telegraphed to you to-day suggesting the announcement of the reprint forthwith, and saying that I will send you some notes. Many points in his articles, . . . it is worth while to rectify now that there is an opportunity.

15 *January*.—I send herewith the chapters to be reprinted, with sundry notes to one of them—notes which are most, if not all of them, rectifications of Mr. Harrison's misstatements.

I presume that though you do not feel up to writing an introduction, yet you will think it desirable to affix a brief preface, stating the reasons for republication. I should like this to be done, because I do not want to let it be erroneously thought that the republication is at

my own instance. If you say, as you tell me, that there has arisen a demand for the articles in a permanent form, and that, in the absence of a publication by the Appletons, there would shortly have been an issue by another publisher; if you say that, finding this to be the case, you applied to me for my assent, it will meet the requirement. Further, you might add that having agreed to the republication, I had furnished you with the materials for some notes to one of the chapters, rectifying sundry of Mr. Harrison's misstatements.[1] These notes I give you in such form as occurs to me; leaving you to modify the form as you please. As I thus simply draw your attention to the errors and rectifications, you may, if you recast the notes, see well to put your initials to them.

I send you not only the article to which I have appended these notes, but also all the articles; that they may be reprinted from the originals as printed here.

21 *January.*—It occurs to me that in the absence of careful instructions, the printers may make some mistakes with regard to the order of the articles, and that therefore it is well just to put the contents of the proposed republication in what seems to me the proper order, with what I propose should be the prefixed and affixed portions.

From E. L. Youmans.

27 *January,* 1885.

I deeply appreciate your solicitude about my imperilled health, and your generous offer of means to go into safer conditions. But that is not my difficulty; so long as I hang on to the *Monthly* my living is assured. . . . I was very glad of your decision. In two hours

[1] Note by Spencer.—"Because, though I had originally not noticed them, from lack of space, I did not agree to further diffusion of them in a permanent form without correction."

after its reception, the articles were on their way to the printers. . . . We have letters inquiring for them. I think it will be well to issue them at the end—on general grounds.

The volume was published by Messrs. D. Appleton and Co., under the title *The Nature and Reality of Religion,* a copy being sent to Mr. Harrison, who forthwith wrote to Spencer (26 May): "As I shall have something to say about this publication, I ought first to ask you, whether it has been made with your knowledge, or has your approval; and in particular whether you know anything of the notes and matter appended to my articles, or if you now adopt them." In his reply next day Spencer stated the circumstances which led to the publication, and his own connection with it and responsibility for it. Mr. Harrison could not see that there was anything in this explanation to justify Spencer in being a party to the reprint of his articles without his knowledge or consent. "May I ask if it is proposed to hand you the profits of a book of which I am (in part) the author, or are these to be retained by your American publishers and friend?" This letter, appearing in the *Times* (29 May), made it necessary that Spencer should now publish the letter he had written to Mr. Harrison two days before. In doing so he referred to the imputation of mercenary motives. "Asking whether I have any share in the profits, Mr. Harrison, not only by this, but by his title—'A New Form of Literary Piracy'—tacitly suggests that I have. . . . If three gentlemen appointed in the usual way decide that under the circumstances, as stated to me by Professor Youmans, I was not justified in the course I took. I will, if Mr. Har-

rison wishes it, request Messrs. Appleton to suppress the book and destroy the stereotype plates, and I will make good their loss to them." And on the 2nd June, on which date Mr. Harrison intimated in the *Times* that he would not pursue the matter further, nor would insist on Spencer's fair offer to submit it to arbitration, Spencer telegraphed to the *Times* from Clovelly: "Rather than have any further question with Mr. Harrison, and rather than have it supposed that I intentionally ignored his copyright claim, I have telegraphed to Messrs. Appleton to stop the sale, destroy the stock and plates, and debit me with their loss." This was followed next day by a letter to the *Times* (4 June), in which he acknowledged that he was wrong in assenting to the republication. "My mind was so engrossed with the due presentation of the controversy that the question of copyright never occurred to me. . . . Hence my error. But my error does not, I think, excuse Mr. Harrison's insult. By cancelling the rest of the edition and the plates, I have done all that remains possible to rectify the effects of my mistake."

On reading this Mr. Harrison disclaimed any intention of bringing against Spencer a charge of desiring money profit out of the reprint, and regretted the use of any words which produced that impression. Meanwhile Spencer wrote to Dr. Youmans, sending him copies of the correspondence.

To E. L. Youmans.

Ilfracombe, 2 *June*, 1885.

You were doubtless greatly astonished by my telegram to the Appletons telling them to stop selling the Har-

rison book. You will be less astonished after reading the enclosed. The thing as you see has had very awkward results here. I ought to have foreseen them.

8 *June*.—I have nothing further to say respecting the Harrison business, except that on the part of many it has produced a greater cordiality of behaviour to me than they have ever shown before.

9 *June*.—I returned home last night, and early this morning learnt that in the *Standard* of Saturday last, there was, in a telegram from New York, a statement to the effect that Messrs. Appleton decline to destroy the stock and plates of the reprinted controversy (as I had telegraphed them to do) on the score that the book would be reprinted by some other publisher. In this expectation they are probably right. . . .

One word respecting the proposal of the Appletons to share the author's profits between Mr. Harrison and myself. If any have at present accrued, or if, in consequence of refusal to do as I have above requested, any should hereafter accrue, then I wish to say that having been, and being now, absolutely indifferent to profit in the matter, I shall decline to accept any portion of the returns.

This last letter was sent to Mr. Harrison to be posted by him after perusal. A telegram from New York, stating that the book had been suppressed, was supposed by Spencer to be "the last act in this disagreeable drama." Mr. Harrison had also expressed the hope that "time may re-establish friendly relations."

To Frederic Harrison.

13 *June*, 1885.

On Thursday night I received a telegram from America, containing the words—"Book suppressed on re-

ceipt of first telegram.'' Whence it appears that the correspondent of the *Standard* was in some way or other misinformed.

Referring to your note received on Thursday, I will do my best to think no more of what has passed, though I shall have considerable difficulty in doing this. You are possibly unaware of the chief cause of the feeling which was aroused in me last year, and has survived down to the present time. Most likely you have thought of it as an effect of controversial antagonism, which I have too persistently manifested. But this is not so. That you may understand the cause of alienation, I must set before you a series of facts.

After giving an account of the origin of the *Descriptive Sociology,* of the time and labour bestowed on it and the heavy financial loss involved—absorbing all the surplus proceeds of his literary work during fourteen years, and compelling him to deny himself comforts he could otherwise have afforded, the letter goes on to say:—

For all these sacrifices I got no thanks. . . . But I little foresaw that they would bring to me something very much the reverse of thanks. I little dreamed that the time, labour, health, and money I had expended for the benefit of others, would become the occasion of a reproach. When you spoke of this '' medley '' of tables as '' a pile of clippings made to order ''—when by this and by your comparison to the lawyer you conveyed the belief (a belief which was circulated in America) that I was dishonest enough to present the world with a garbled body of evidence, and foolish enough to suppose that I could in that way bolster up false conclusions, you gave me a deep wound. Such a wound, given even to one who had not in various ways injured himself for

good ends, would be sufficiently severe; but coming on one who, for so long a time, had suffered various evils to discharge an honourable obligation and achieve a public benefit, was too serious to be easily healed.

The recent incident has of course not tended to further the healing, and you can hardly suppose that I can forthwith establish anything like cordial relations with one who has inflicted on me immeasurably more pain than has been inflicted by any other man. But I will do my best; and time may obliterate the impression produced by what has passed.

Mr. Harrison hastened to express regret that he had caused annoyance by his remarks about the *Descriptive Sociology*. "Nothing was further from my thought than that you had in any sense garbled the evidence, or had any object other than the honourable pursuit of truth. What I said referred solely to the philosophic value of a particular method of proof. . . . But where you have given so much to the cause of truth, I can reckon the 'Tables' as amongst the least of your gifts."

The course adopted by Spencer was very disconcerting to his friends in New York. "All the newspaper demonstrations have been regularly cabled to us with tormenting incompleteness," wrote Dr. Youmans. "I am profoundly sorry about the transaction, and that any agency of mine should have got you into so annoying and disagreeable a position. I care nothing about it for myself, but I care something for the rights and justice of the case; and as at present advised I shall not be satisfied to leave it where it is left by your order of suppression."

To E. L. Youmans.

23 *June,* 1885.

The thing has been a series of blunders from the beginning. If instead of telegraphing you at once in reply to your letter in January, I had duly thought all round the matter, I might have known that something of the kind which has happened would be likely to happen. . . . The essential reason why I took the course I did was, that in consistency I felt bound to respect an equitable claim to copyright, and not to countenance a transaction which implicates me in disregard of that claim. As I have explained, I was so engrossed at the time by the thought of the correct presentation of the controversy, which threatened to be incorrectly reproduced, that the notion of copyright never entered into my head —so little did it do so that the publication of Harrison's letter, for the first time revealed this to me as a grievance. . . . But having been reminded that this was a ground of complaint, I admitted it; since I cannot consistently contend for international copyright without myself recognising the claim to international copyright, even though the law does not; and consequently I ought not to implicate myself in any transaction which ignores it. I therefore felt that I had made a mistake (quite unconsciously) in overlooking this claim, and that for that reason I ought properly to signalise the fact by suppressing the book.

On learning that Dr. Youmans was preparing a vindication of the conduct of Spencer, the Appletons, and himself throughout the transaction, he intimated that "it would be undesirable to let it be issued here—very undesirable. The matter has dropped through."

To E. L. Youmans.

Stott Park, Ulverstone, 28 *July,* 1885.

I got the proofs just as I was leaving town. . . .

I do not see why you are so dissatisfied with the arti-

cle. I think it very clear and effective, and so do my friends here. When I wrote in reply to your previous two letters, and said that, however good it might be, its republication here would be impolitic, I was too egotistically occupied with my own share in the matter. I did not bear in mind that you and the Appletons have good reason to wish for the publication as a means of justifying yourselves to the English public.

If this can be done in such way as to leave me out of the question, I shall be glad; but I continue averse to anything which may look like a revival of the matter in my interests.[1]

A cheque sent to Mr. Harrison for his proportion of profit on the sales made before the book was suppressed served to rekindle the dying embers of the controversy. In a letter in the *Times* (7 October) Mr. Harrison declined the cheque, while recognising the honourable motives of Messrs. Appleton. Spencer thought the occasion a good one for a letter from Dr. Youmans. The aim of this letter, which appeared in the *Times* of 16th November, was to correct certain mistaken impressions and to point out difficulties experienced by fair-minded American publishers. "Until international copyright comes we cannot have its salutary fruits." In a more or less dissentient leader the *Times* thought that Dr. Youmans rather unduly enhanced the publisher's liability and effaced Mr. Spencer's.

As was expected, the suppressed book could not be suppressed. The first intimation Spencer had of its reissue was towards the end of October, in a letter from

[1] Dr. Youmans's vindication appeared in the *Popular Science Monthly* for August, and has been reprinted in *Edward Livingston Youmans,* pp. 562-83. It includes the correspondence between Mr. Harrison and Spencer published in the *Times.*

Dr. Youmans, to whom he wrote: "Respecting the reissued volume it is very well that you did not let me know anything about it, so I am left free from any kind of responsibility." A few days before Christmas he got a copy of *The Insuppressible Book,* edited, with comments by Gail Hamilton, and published by S. E. Cassino and Co., of Boston.

With all this turmoil and vexation it is surprising that he was able to complete "Ecclesiastical Institutions," which was published in the autumn of 1885.

The death of "George Eliot" in December, 1880, revived the rumours, already heard occasionally in this country and frequently in the United States, that Spencer had been in love with her. These stories had for years caused him great annoyance. Feeling that he could not himself do anything to contradict these absolutely untrue statements, he laid the matter in strict confidence before his friends, Professors Huxley and Tyndall, Mr. Potter, and Dr. Youmans, in order that they, knowing the facts should, if the rumour were repeated in their hearing, privately contradict it, leaving such private contradiction to have what effect it might in checking its further circulation. The forthcoming *Life*[1] of "George Eliot" seemed to furnish a suitable opportunity for giving an authoritative denial to the report, and he was anxious that a note to this effect should be inserted in the book. Mr. Cross at first agreed, but eventually, after some correspondence, no such note was inserted. The reasons for its omission are thus referred to by Spencer:—

[1] Published early in 1885.

To E. L. Youmans.

4 *February*, 1885.

George Eliot's Life has just come out, and is being read by everybody—satisfactory enough in so far as concerns myself in many respects, it is unsatisfactory in that respect about which I wrote you some years ago—the report that I had been in love with her.

After consulting with friends here at the time I wrote you—Huxley, Tyndall and Potter, to whom, as to you, I told the actual facts of the case in strict confidence—I, acting on their advice, requested Cross, as the least thing that could be done, to put in a note denying this report. To this he assented, being able fully to do so, not on the basis of my authority only, but on the basis of her authority. When the time came, we differed with regard to the wording of the note: I wishing a simple denial of the report, and nothing more; he wishing to frame it in another way, but a way to which I was obliged to object, because it would imply something that was not true. Eventually, a note vaguely worded, repudiating all of whatever reports had been in circulation, was agreed to; but when the book was passing through the press, and the proofs were seen by Lord Acton and Sir Charles Bowen (the judge), this note was objected to by them as one which was likely to cause gossip. Of course he [Mr. Cross] was master of the situation, and as he would not so far modify it as to make it simply the denial I wished, and as the form which he reluctantly would have assented to, was one which made the matter still more liable to the misinterpretation I wished to exclude, the note was finally abandoned.

Cross argued that the indirect evidence would amply suffice to refute the report. I think when you come to look at the state of the case, and such extracts as are given from April, 1852 onward, you will see that this is by no means the fact, and that any one who had pre-

viously accepted the report, would find nothing to dissipate his belief in it.

As I said to Cross in the course of a correspondence we had at the time when the note was finally cancelled, he had the opportunity of saying by a few words which he could give on double authority, that the statement, as it had been current, was utterly unfounded; and yet he deliberately has not done this, and has left it to remain current, if not even to be confirmed; for it seems to me that some may take the facts as they stand rather as verification than otherwise. . . . Though he was able with facility to rectify the matter, I cannot do so; and had no means of correcting such absurd misstatements as those which you told me had been current in America, and, so far as I see, shall never have the means of doing this.

Spencer's relations with "George Eliot," and his very high appreciation of her character and mental endowments have been dealt with in the *Autobiography* (i., 456-62).

CHAPTER XIX

THE FACTORS OF ORGANIC EVOLUTION

(*January*, 1886—*September*, 1889)

The working out of what he regarded as his final addition to the general doctrine of evolution was well advanced by about the middle of January, 1886.

To E. L. Youmans.

19 *January*, 1886.

The first of the Darwin articles, which will appear under the title of "The Factors of Organic Evolution," I expect to take to the printers to-day, and the other is commenced. As there will be a good deal of biological detail in it, I shall submit it for criticism to some experts—Flower and Michael Foster among others. Whether I shall ask Huxley and Hooker to look through it, I do not know; for they are somewhat my antagonists in the matter; having always been opponents of the belief that there is inheritance of functionally-produced modifications—or rather, having always slighted the belief as one for which there is no adequate evidence.

To his German translator he thus states the purport of the articles.

To B. Vetter.

19 *January*, 1886.

They will be in the main a criticism upon the current conception of Mr. Darwin's views; showing that this

conception is erroneous in ignoring altogether one of the beliefs set forth by Dr. Erasmus Darwin and by Lamarck—the belief that the inheritance of organic modifications produced by use and disuse, has been a cause of evolution. The thesis of the first paper will be that this cause has been all along a co-operative cause, and that in its absence, all the higher stages of organic evolution would have been impossible.

The second paper will have for its object to point out that besides the factor of "natural selection," now exclusively recognised, and besides the factor previously alleged, which has of late been improperly ignored, there is yet a third factor, preceding the other two in order of time, and universally co-operative with them from the beginning, which has to be taken into account before all the phenomena of organisation can be understood—a factor which has to be recognised before organic evolution is rightly conceived as forming a part of evolution at large.

To T. H. Huxley.

26 *January*, 1886.

Here is something to exasperate you. There has never been any sympathy between us in respect of the doctrine defended in the accompanying article; and I remember within this year an utterance of opinion which seemed to imply that there was not much chance of approximation.

Regarding you as in this matter an antagonist, I felt for some time a good deal of hesitation as to the propriety of submitting lucubrations of mine to your criticism. But I have finally concluded that to break through the long standing usage, in pursuance of which I have habitually submitted my biological writing to your castigation, and so often profited by so doing, would seem like a distrust of your candour—a distrust which I cannot entertain. I therefore, as in times long gone by, beg of you such attention as is needed to glance

through the inclosed proof, and let me benefit by any objections you have to make.

From T. H. Huxley.

31 *January,* 1886.

Mind, I have no *a priori* objection to the transmission of functional modifications whatever. In fact, as I told you, I should rather like it to be true. But I argued against the assumption (with Darwin as I do with you) of the operation of a factor which, if you will forgive me for saying so, seems as far off sufficiently trustworthy evidence now as ever it was.

To T. H. Huxley.

3 *February,* 1886.

Pray accept my apology along with my thanks for the benefit of your criticisms, sundry of which I am utilising to guard myself against objections.

You will see, however, from this admission that I remain substantially " a hardened unbeliever "—believer, I mean. And now see how good deeds bring their evils. Here is a batch of comments as long as, or longer than, your criticisms. However, you are not obliged to read them unless you care to do so. I write them to show why on sundry points I still think the positions taken are defensible.

With the first revised proof of the second of the articles he wrote to Dr. Youmans: " This, I suspect, will be my last addition to the theory of Evolution. After sixty-five one cannot expect to do more than write out one's ideas previously arrived at." He advised Professor Huxley when criticising the second article to confine himself to marginal notes—suggesting that perhaps " there needs only one marginal note."[1]

[1] *Life of Professor Huxley,* ii. 135.

To T. H. Huxley.

23 *March,* 1886.

Thank you heartily for your criticisms, "captious and cantankerous," as you admit them to be. But what a lover of fighting you are! Here you confess that you castigate my heterodoxies with a view to better fitting them to disturb the orthodox.

Various of your criticisms lead me to make alterations that shall shut the door to mis-apprehension; and sundry alterations of more substantial kinds. While I make them, I jot down for my own satisfaction, certain comments which you may or may not read as you please.

When sending this article as finally revised he told Dr. Youmans (24 March):

Flower made no objections at all; Michael Foster none of any moment. Huxley has badgered me in detail a good deal, and hence most of the alterations contained in this proof. But, though he does not commit himself to my view, he has not said anything which tends to undermine it.

On reading the articles Dr. Arthur Downes was struck by the bearing on Spencer's views of some original work which he and Mr. Blunt had published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society in 1877 and subsequent years. Two or three of these papers were sent to Spencer.

To Arthur Downes.

10 *May,* 1886.

The marked passages, of course, were specially interesting to me as showing experimentally and in a specific way, the occurrence of an effect which I had inferred *a priori.*

The two articles as published in the *Nineteenth Century* were written with the intention of republishing

them in a permanent form after such interval as the editor agrees to: and I should very well like to make an appendix of some of the passages contained in your two papers, as verifying certain parts of my argument.

In consequence of pressure of space, the editor of the *Nineteenth Century* induced me to abridge the articles. Among passages which I had to take out, were two in which I have commented upon a fact to which I see you in another way refer: namely that protoplasm is habitually found inside of a protecting envelope. . . . These passages I cut out will, of course, be restored in the permanent form of the articles. I name them now because otherwise it may seem to you that I have utilised certain suggestions contained in your papers without acknowledgment. I cannot send you as I should like to do, a proof of the article in its unabridged form: for, when the abridged proof came back from the *Nineteenth Century,* I threw it into the waste-paper basket as done with. But the printer has the type standing, and no doubt has also impressions at hand of the articles as they stood before abridgment. If you care to do so, I should very well like if you would some day when it is convenient, call upon me at the Athenæum, and go with me to the printers to see that this is so.

When sending the present writer a copy of the above, Dr. Downes remarked that it " seems to afford a curious proof of his careful attention to detail, and of a highly scrupulous and punctilious character. I was unable to call upon him and never saw him, but I wrote to thank him and to say how unnecessary was the proposed visit to the printer."

To E. L. Youmans.

19 *March,* 1886.

The copyright question is being revived here. There exists a body, . . . consisting of publishers and authors,

for advancing the question, and a few days ago it sent a deputation to Mr. Mundella. . . . Their aim is to get an international copyright recognised in such form as that they can purchase the author's copyright here and with it include the copyright abroad. . . . If this is allowed, the author will get scarcely anything more for his copyright than if there were no international copyright. . . . The American bill should enact that no copyright, save one held by the foreign author, can be recognised in America, . . . and directly or by implication, enact that copyright negotiations must be direct between the foreign author and the American publisher.

Spencer's depression about this time was extreme. Many of his most intimate friends were, like himself, ill. Professor Tyndall was not far from the truth when he said: "It would seem as if we were all breaking up together." In a letter to Professor Huxley in March Spencer mentions that he had been to see Professor Tyndall.

In the course of conversation I suggested that yachting would be the thing—yachting about the coasts with the ability to go into port every night so as to get quiet rest. Afterwards thinking about this, it occurred to me that such a thing would be admirable also for you and for me. We all three of us want a lounging life in the open air, with just enough variety to keep us alive, and the exhilarating effects of a little pleasant company. I do not see, too, why the thing would not suit my friend Potter. What do you say to our chartering a yacht for a couple of months . . . and going hither and thither about the coasts of the English Channel, including Jersey, Guernsey, the Scilly Islands, &c.

Recalling the Nile expedition, one feels inclined to say that had the suggestion been carried out Spencer would

have been the first to run away. When this idea had to be given up he took rooms near the Crystal Palace. But the move did him no good. Another project was unfolded to Miss Flora Smith. "A while since I had hoped to profit by taking up my abode at the Pavilion Hotel, Folkestone, and going backwards and forwards to France every day for the benefit of the sea air, motion and liveliness. But I was balked by the opening of the Folkestone Exhibition." His idea now was to get Mr. and Miss Lott to join him at some sea-side resort. This also came to nothing owing to the illness of his friend having taken an unexpected turn for the worse.

To Edward Lott.

1 *July*, 1886.

My Dear Old Friend,—When I saw you, the last Christmas but one, I little thought it would be the last time we should shake hands.

It is grievous to me to think of losing my oldest and best friend; and now that I am myself very much invalided, the consciousness of the loss will make me feel that life, not very attractive to me now-a-days at the best, is made less attractive than before. It has been clear to me that for months past the pains you have had to bear, bodily and mental, have greatly outbalanced such small satisfactions as the days brought; and now the sad accounts I receive of you, show me that your hours, passed in almost continuous suffering, must make life a great burden.

If as I fear, there is now no hope that I shall ever hear from you again, and have the pleasure of responding, pray accept this as the last good-bye of your sorrowing old friend.

[If in time, to be read to him or not, according as is thought best.]

Before this letter arrived Mr. Lott had breathed his last. Beginning before Spencer's career as a writer was thought of by Mr. Lott, or was more than a vague possibility to Spencer himself, the friendship between them had never wavered during five and forty years.

While mourning the loss of one friend, he was full of apprehension about another; who, with a loyal devotion rarely equalled and never surpassed, had stood by him for over a quarter of a century.

FROM E. L. YOUMANS.

5 *July*, 1886.

All the indications are decisive, that I can hold on but a little longer and must leave things much as they are. I wish I could write you about many matters that have heretofore been of interest between us, but it cannot be, and is perhaps just as well. Good or bad, whatever is done is done. I was very much touched by the slip you sent me in your note of May 8, from your Autobiographic sketches,[1] speaking so highly of the work I have done. The recognition is most gratifying, and I thank you for your kindness and generosity in making it. I have done nothing myself that will have any claim to survive; but I shall be fully content to be remembered through this noble tribute from a man of justice, who knows the purposes by which I have been animated in my life-work.

TO E. L. YOUMANS.

20 *July*, 1886.

I was much saddened yesterday to receive a verification of the fears I have been for some weeks entertaining, that your silence was due to illness. . . .

It is well, however, that you can take so calm a view of the matter as your description and reflections imply;

[1] *Autobiography*, ii., 61.



EDWARD L. YOUMANS.

and it may be that when life has to be carried on under the conditions you describe, the desire for continuance of it may fitly decrease. . . .

This is the view taken by the relatives of one who has just left us—my old and valued friend Lott. . . . You saw enough of him to know what a fine nature he had. . . .

However, I, like you, take a calm view of the matter. I value life for little else than my work; and had I finished it, I should care little about the issue. . . .

Whatever comes, we may at any rate both of us have some satisfaction in the consciousness of having done our work conscientiously, prompted by high motives; and whenever it ends, the friendship between us may be looked back upon by the survivor, as one of the valued things of his life.

But more letters may still pass between us, my dear old friend; and in that anticipation I continue yours with very affectionate regards.

The *Autobiography* was a godsend, giving him the necessary occupation without overtaxing him. When returning the proof of Chapter XXI. Professor Huxley wrote:—

I am immensely tickled with your review of your own book [*Social Statics*]. That is something most originally Spencerian. . . . How odd it is to look back through the vista of years! Reading your account of me I had the sensation of studying a fly in amber. I had utterly forgotten the particular circumstances that brought us together. Considering what wilful tykes we both are (you particularly), I think it is a great credit to both of us that we are firmer friends now than we were then.

By September he had made up his mind not to face the winter in town. The choice lay between Brighton

and Bournemouth, the chief attraction of the latter being the presence there of Mr. Potter and several members of his family, "for I pine for lack of those I care for." Eventually, however, he decided in favour of Brighton. He was interesting himself about this time in an article Miss Beatrice Potter was writing, one of her points being that any theory of economics that overlooks pathology is useless

To Miss Beatrice Potter.

2 *October,* 1886.

So far as I understand them the objections which you are making to the doctrines of the elder political economists, are a good deal of the kind that have of late years been made, and, as I think, not rightly made. . . .

Physiology formulates the laws of the bodily functions in a state of health, and absolutely ignores pathology—cannot take any account whatever of functions that are not normal. Meanwhile, a rational pathology can come into existence only by virtue of the previously established physiology which has ignored it: until there is an understanding of the functions in health, there is no understanding of them in disease. Further, when rational pathology has been thus established, the course of treatment indicated by it is the course which aims as far as possible to re-establish the normal functions—*does not aim to readjust physiology in such way as to adapt it to pathological states.*

Just so is it with that account of the normal relations of industrial actions constituting political economy properly so called. No account can be taken by it of disorder among these actions or impediments to them. It cannot recognise pathological social states at all; and further, the understanding of these pathological social states wholly depends upon previous establishment of that part of social physiology which constitutes political

economy. And, moreover, if these pathological states are due to the traversing of free competition and free contract, which political economy assumes, the course of treatment is not the readjustment of the principles of political economy, but the establishment as far as possible of free competition and free contract.

If as I understand you, you would so modify politico-economical principles as to take practical cognisance of pathological states, then you would simply organise pathological states, and things would go from bad to worse.

If he could not enter upon a controversy himself he would contrive to induce one or other of his friends to do so, as when he got Professor Huxley to reply to Mr. Lilly's article on "Materialism and Morality."[1]

To T. H. Huxley.

11 *December,* 1886.

I may be proud of what you called my "diabolical plot." Notwithstanding your characterisation, I think that, considering the result, I may say contrariwise that it has succeeded divinely. I was greatly amused by your article, which was admirably adapted to its purpose.

The friendship between Professor Huxley and Spencer had, during all these years, withstood the disintegrating effect of diversity of opinion on many subjects. Writing in January, 1887, the former mentions having been asked to become an honorary "something or other" of "a body calling itself the London Schools League (I think)," Spencer and Mrs. Fawcett being also honorary members. "Now you may be sure that I should be glad enough to be associated with you in any-

[1] *Life of Professor Huxley,* ii., 154.

thing—but considering the innumerable battles we have fought over education, vaccination, and so on—it seemed to me that if the programme of the League was wide enough to take us both for figure heads—it must be so elastic as to verge upon infinite extensibility; and that one or other of us would be in a false position.'' The body alluded to was the London Liberty Club. On learning that he '' was about to be conspicuously bracketed with Mrs. Fawcett,'' he tells Professor Huxley, '' I forthwith wrote to decline the honour, and as I cannot well give the cold shoulder to a body which adopts my own particular view of the functions of government, I have written to exchange my honorary membership for a paying membership.''

The year 1887 had not gone far on its course when he was overtaken by a great, though not unexpected, bereavement.

To E. L. Youmans.

Brighton, 1 *January*, 1887.

It is a long time since I heard anything about you and I am getting anxious to have a report. Pray let me know how you have fared during the cold weather. . . .

Though the day suggests it, it is absurd for me to wish you, or for you to wish me, a happy New Year. There is not much happiness remaining in store for either of us.

Pray dictate a few lines when you get this.

This letter reached Dr. Youmans on the 17th. Next day Miss Youmans wrote: '' Yours of January 1st reached us last night, and when I read it to him he spoke very tenderly of your case and said, ' I will dic-

tate a few lines to Mr. Spencer to-morrow'; but before the morning had fairly dawned he had ceased to breathe.'' Thus ended one of the purest and most steadfast friendships the world of letters has ever seen. From the day on which his life came first into contact with Spencer's, Dr. Youmans devoted himself with rare unselfishness to the promulgation of evolution doctrines, which were identified in his estimation with the highest good of humanity. An earlier American friend than Dr. Youmans was Mr. Silsbee; but as far as one can form an opinion from the perusal of the correspondence, the help rendered by the latter in introducing Spencer to the American public was inappreciable. In the proof slip from the *Autobiography* (ii., 61), sent to Dr. Youmans on May 8, 1886, Spencer must have placed a higher value on Mr. Silsbee's efforts than is implied in the passing reference to him in the passage as finally adopted. A month or two after her brother's death, Miss Youmans endeavoured to correct Spencer's misapprehension.

From Miss Youmans.

13 *April*, 1887.

In getting the '86 letters for the copyist I came upon the slip concerning Edward, from your *Autobiography*, sent him with such tender forethought last summer. On reading it at the time, your statement about Mr. Silsbee's early efforts in your behalf surprised me. I afterwards spoke of it to Edward, and he confirmed my impression that you were in error, but when I proposed to tell you about it he said "Oh, it's a very small matter," in a tone that discouraged the attempt. . . . The circular you sent to Mr. Silsbee, he gave to his townsman Rev. Mr. Johnson, whom Edward shortly after met at Mr. Manning's in Brooklyn. Edward started the subject of

your writings which had taken great hold of him, and being thus reminded of the circular in his vest pocket, Mr. Johnson at once gave it to Edward saying that Mr. Silsbee, who gave it him, knew Mr. Spencer personally. . . . Within a week from the time he met Mr. Johnson, he went to Salem to learn what he might about you. He found Silsbee, and he told me last summer that while Mr. Silsbee spoke admiringly of you, he manifested no enthusiasm about your ideas—did not seem acquainted with them, and up to the time of Edward's visit, had done nothing but hand your circular to Mr. Johnson; and in Edward's opinion he would not of his own accord have made a movement in the matter. Influenced by Edward, he did take hold of the work, going to Boston and Cambridge to get influential names for the subscription; but (and I mention it because it bears on the case) Edward said he was never able to undo the mischief Silsbee wrought in Boston and its suburbs by his unfortunate aggressive manner of approaching people. He said he never met Dr. Holmes afterward but that gentleman alluded to the disagreeable experience—the way he was assailed by Mr. Silsbee in your behalf."[1]

This was Jubilee year. He was invited by Mrs. Jose, with whom his Aunt Anna lived, to contribute towards "a very mild feast for the Hintonians as a public commemoration." This he was unable to do.

To Mrs. Jose.

Brighton, 30 *May*, 1887.

Do not suppose, however, that . . . I am unwilling to contribute towards the pleasures and, I hope, the benefits of the Hintonians. I presume the Hinton library still exists. If so, I will . . . send you a cheque for ten

[1] See also *Edward Livingston Youmans*, p. 105.

guineas to be spent in books (chiefly works of science, and voyages and travels) to be added to the Hinton library. On the inside of the cover of each of these books I propose to have pasted the following inscription.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF
THE REV. THOMAS SPENCER, M.A.
FOUNDER OF THE HINTON LIBRARY
AND OF OTHER
INSTITUTIONS FOR THE BENEFIT OF HINTON
THIS VOLUME
IS PRESENTED BY
HIS GRATEFUL NEPHEW
HERBERT SPENCER.

Owing to circumstances over which he had no control, it was not till the beginning of 1895 that the gift was bestowed.

With improved health came the wish for change of surroundings. Yachting about the Channel was again thought of. He longed also for the company of children. In answer to his pleading, Mrs. W. H. Cripps not only sent him two of her own, but volunteered to get her married sisters to spare him one or two of theirs. In this way began a custom which continued for years—cementing still more closely the bonds of affection between him and the family of Mr. and Mrs. Potter. In November he went to Bournemouth. "I have got rooms in the same house as the Potters, where I shall have the occasional companionship of three generations."

To T. H. Huxley.

1 *December,* 1887.

The black border on your letter of last week made me open it in hurried alarm, remembering what you had said respecting your wife a few days previously. To

say that I was relieved on reading it seems strange considering that it announced the death of your daughter. But I coincide with the feeling that you expressed that, considering the hopeless state in which she has long been, and the probability of continued painful decay, it was better that the end should come as it did.

But it is sad to think of so promising a career so early blighted—much successful and enjoyable achievement, joined, as one may infer, with a great deal of domestic happiness, closing so early after so much suffering.

He returned to London on the last day of January, 1888, after eighteen months absence, greatly improved in health, though not perhaps coming up to Professor Huxley's description of him—"as lively as a cricket." At the same time there appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* an article on "The Struggle for Existence in Human Society," which Professor Huxley feared had "made Spencer very angry—but he knows, I think he has been doing mischief this long time."

To T. H. Huxley.

38, Queen's Gardens, 6 *February*, 1888.

I have nothing to object, and everything to agree to. In fact, the leading propositions are propositions that I have myself enunciated either publicly or privately. It was but the day before leaving Bournemouth that I was shocking some members of the circle upstairs at Kildare by insisting on the non-moral character of Nature—immoral, indeed, I rather think I called it; pointing out that for 99 hundredths of the time life has existed on the Earth (or one might say 999 thousandths), the success has been confined to those beings which, from a human point of view, would be called criminal.

So, too, with the equal readiness of Nature to retrogress as to progress: see my reply to Martineau and the first part of the *Principles of Sociology.*

Last spring I began to set down a number of leading thoughts, which I intended to incorporate in the *Inductions of Ethics* if ever I lived to write it, and in the course of it was pointing out that same progression from brute ethics to human ethics which you have well insisted upon.

The remaining dominant point in this first division of your article is one in respect of which I fancy you thought I had overlooked an important consideration. When, sometime ago, in a speech, or address I think it was, you referred to those who insisted on the evils of war, and the need for peace as a means to higher civilisation, and when you pointed out that the war of the sword had to be followed by the war of the loom (as one might call it), I fancied that you had me in your thought. But, I have long ago insisted on the same truth, as you will see in the *Study of Sociology* (page 179), where after admitting that war of the primitive kind by killing off the inferior races produces a balance of advantage during the earlier stages, I have gone on to insist that later "the purifying process, continuing still an important one, remains to be carried on by industrial war."

But while I am at one with you in this preliminary argument, I dissent from the conclusion drawn and from the corollaries. So far from believing that there is more misery now than there has been, I think there is less, and that there is no pressing need for the measures you allege. The mere fact that the rate of mortality has been diminishing, seems to me alone sufficient proof of this. The current impression with regard to the distress of the lower classes reminds me of a number of other untrue impressions. During the time when the mass of the people were profoundly ignorant there was no recognition whatever of their ignorance; but when

they became partially instructed there arose an outcry that the nation was perishing for lack of knowledge, and that State agency was needful to spread it. Similarly with drinking. While drunkenness was extremely general there were no protests, but when sobriety had made considerable advances, there came an outcry that drunkenness was the root of all evil, and that the State must step in to prevent it. So, too, with the position of women. While they were slaves and during the long ages when they were ill-treated, not a word was said about their rights, now that they have come to be well treated the screaming sisterhood make the world ring with their wrongs, and they scream loudest in America, where women are treated with the greatest regard. So, I say, is it with the matter of the distress. Now that the distress is far less than it used to be, there comes an outcry about its greatness, and predictions that things will come to a crash unless it is stopped.

From your proposed measures of course I dissent. I feel strongly tempted to write an essay under the title "The Struggle for Existence—another Programme." But I must resist the temptation, and economise what little power I have: a further motive for refraining being that my criticisms might cause a coolness between us which I should greatly regret.

10 *February.*—My anticipation of possible evils, referred not to some first stage of a controversy as to probable second stages; for when once a controversy is commenced there is no knowing how it will end. We are both of us combative, and I regarded it as tolerably certain that to my criticism there would come a rejoinder from you, and again another from me. The danger of some disturbance of harmony might in such case become considerable. In oral controversy I have so often had reason to be vexed with myself for having said things which I had not supposed I should say at

the outset, that I am getting a little cautious how I run the risk.

The improvement in health, begun in Bournemouth, was continued in London. Nevertheless when the X dinner for March came round he had to stay away. In reply to Professor Huxley's banter that " if young men from the country will go plunging into the dissipations of the Metropolis, nemesis follows," he wrote (10 March) :—

It was not that " life in London " " came over " " the young man from the country "; but he was come over by another " young man from the country." I had been dining at the Athenæum with Galton, and had quite enough talking, when suddenly Masson made his appearance. I was very glad to see him. He joined us at the same table, and there followed half an hour's animated talking, laughing, and story-telling. . . .

Never mind your strength running to hair instead of to brains, so long as you are thereby kept out of mischief. If, following out the parallel of Samson (about whom you seem to think I know nothing), we could blind you for a while to all save novels, it might not be a bad thing—furthering at once your own welfare and the peace of mind of your antagonists.[1]

It was a curious coincidence that about the time he was submitting proofs of certain paragraphs of the *Autobiography* containing criticisms on Art to Mr. Philip H. Calderon, R.A., and to Mr. John Brett, A.R.A.,[2] the *Architect* (27 January) had a reference to his opinions on Art. Hence a disclaimer in a letter to the editor (24 February). " In my published writings

[1] *Life of Professor Huxley*, ii., 207. [2] *Autobiography*, ii., 219.

I have not anywhere expressed either the opinions ascribed to me or any other. Necessarily, therefore, some utterances of mine, either to friends or to an amanuensis, must have originated the statement. In its general drift the statement is correct, but, as might be expected, it is incorrect in detail." When it was pointed out that the paragraph in question was reprinted from his own essay on "Precedent in Architecture," published in January, 1842, all he could say was: "I never dreamed that the reference was to a letter nearly fifty years old."

A proposal was made by Miss Beatrice Potter on behalf of an American gentleman that he should sit to Millais for his portrait. To this he at first consented, but next day drew back.

To Miss Beatrice Potter.

5 *May*, 1888.

Yesterday I quite forgot myself, or rather forgot one of my strong opinions, when I gave my consent to the project for a portrait.

The practice of getting up subscriptions for this and the other purpose has grown into a grave social abuse, against which I have of late years more and more protested. People are blackmailed for all kinds of purposes. Among other subscriptions raised are those for testimonials and testimonial portraits; and against such subscriptions also I protest.

On one occasion I voluntarily subscribed without being asked, because I felt under a personal obligation (the case of Sir Andrew Clark), but on sundry other occasions I have, when asked to subscribe for the painting of portraits, felt that I was under a kind of moral coercion, which I did not like. Having been asked I

felt obliged to subscribe because of the feeling that would have arisen had I declined.

Now as I dislike being myself put under coercion of this kind, I dislike having other persons put under such coercion in respect of myself. I dislike the thought that any one should be asked to tax themselves with a view to raising a fund for painting a portrait of me. I feel that some might give willingly, but many reluctantly, and most would regard the thing as a nuisance. I therefore must decline agreeing to the project which you named to me.

The prospect of improved health and working power, with which he had come to London at the end of January, became clouded before many months. By midsummer he had made up his mind that a radical change in his mode of life must be attempted. Hence an urgent request that Mr. and Mrs. Grant Allen should take him as a boarder, which, at considerable inconvenience to themselves, they consented to do. The move to Dorking took place in June. But the bad weather, keeping him indoors, produced great depression of spirits. He was, in fact, getting confirmed in that state which became more and more pronounced as year succeeded year —a state of restless longing for society when it was away from him, and shrinking from it when it was within his reach.

His anti-aggression sentiments remained as pronounced as ever, though he had been compelled to stand aside from the public position he had occupied in 1882. Since then he had published "Ecclesiastical Institutions," in which the clergy are taken to task for their indifference to, or support of, the aggressive policy of the nation.

To the Hon. Auberon Herbert.

Dorking, 30 *September,* 1888.

I wish you would instigate Mr. Bradlaugh (with whom I see you have been expressing sympathy) to commence a crusade against the abominable filibustering which is now disgracing us. Since the annexation of Burma we have had Zulu-land, New Guinea, North Borneo, East Africa, as well as the now current and pending aggressions in Sikkim and the Black Mountain, which doubtless will end by and by in annexations there. Now there is a talk too of Bechuana-land. To me the whole thing is atrocious and horrible, and so far from being likely to stop, it goes on faster day by day, resulting in a re-barbarisation of the nation.

Bradlaugh would, I think, be a good man to initiate an agitation of a pronounced kind against the whole policy. There are several strong positions capable of conclusive proof and illustration which he might take up.

First, that the whole policy ends in national loss, since the alleged commercial advantages never compensate for the cost of perpetual wars joined with the cost of official administration, and that from this loss the working class, along with other classes, eventually suffers.

Second, that the whole process is utterly demoralising, as a continual fostering of those sentiments which, joined with development of militant organisation, end in destruction of free institutions and despotism.

Third, that it will inevitably result in an increased demand for increased armaments to defend the greater number of dependencies and also to make England safe against those dangers of war which increasing jealousy of the continental nations will produce.

Fourth, that this increasing demand for armaments, perpetually pushed as it will be by the governing classes, who have an interest in military extension and the extension of dependencies which give places for younger

sons, will end in established conscription, which the working classes will above all others feel.

Fifth, that the organisations, established and dissenting, for teaching Christianity absolutely fail in their duty in checking these political burglaries everywhere going on, and that to their disgrace the preaching of justice and mercy has to be undertaken by rationalists.

I begin to see the meaning of that American senator who spoke of England as a " devil-fish among the nations," for here she is spreading out her arms all over the world and fixing her suckers perpetually in more and more places. There wants some one who, with a voice of thunder, will denounce all these abominations. And I wish you also would take part in such a crusade. It seems to me now more important than anything else.[1]

During the winter of 1888-9, when the Grant Allens were abroad, he remained at Dorking, trying now this remedy, now that, to relieve the loneliness that weighed upon him. The social intercourse he considered good for him was not easy to get or to keep. Thus he wards off a visit the Tyndalls proposed making: " My friends are my worst enemies, and I have to be continually on my guard against them, and especially friends in whom I am most interested, and conversation with whom is most likely to become animated. Humdrum people I am not much afraid of." Nor was he afraid of children. For this unfailing source of happiness he was again indebted to Mrs. W. H. Cripps, who " lent " him two of her children for a fortnight. After their return home

[1] "The above was sent to Mr. Auberon Herbert unsigned along with a letter suggesting that he should hand it on in that form. I did not wish my name mentioned because it would give a handle against me and impede my usefulness in other directions." [Note by Spencer.]

he sent their mother a letter which reveals his painstaking solicitude for what he considered the welfare of those with whom he had anything to do.

To Mrs. W. H. Cripps.

17 *December,* 1888.

I was glad to get your letter saying that the children had arrived safely. I am glad that you found them so much better.

Do not put down the improvement to Dorking as a place. The hills around condense fog when it is fine elsewhere, and the climate is relaxing. . . .

The difference in their state is almost exclusively due to difference of regimen. I stopped the tepid bath in the morning and gave them hot. Chilling the skin, with their state of lungs, is very detrimental. They were, as you have seen, more thickly clothed both indoors and out, and they ought to have flannel next the skin all over. The bare or ill-clothed legs which the present fashion of children's dresses involves is the cause of no end of illnesses, and undermines no end of constitutions. Further, their necks should be clothed. With their delicate mucous membranes and liability to colds, the skin around the throat should be protected.

While with me they had animal food three times a day—substantial breakfast at half-past 8, including fish, egg or bacon, along with their bread and milk, and this enabled them to go on until dinner-time at 1, without anything between. At dinner they had as much meat and other food as they liked. Then there was a slight meal at half-past 4, and another substantial animal food meal at 7. Moreover they were checked in drinking so much water at meals. They had got into a morbid craving for water which was detrimental. This was very easily broken, and improved their digestions. I did not send them to bed so early as they commonly go. Send-

ing children to bed before they are sleepy is a mistake, and too much bed lowers the action of the heart.

I found it undesirable that they should have all their morning exercise at once—their walk after lessons was too long with their present state. I sent them out when the weather permitted for a quarter of an hour before they began their lessons, and then for a short time after their lessons.

Judy should not be allowed to read or tell stories in the evening, but should be occupied by some mechanical game or amusement. Her brain is excitable, and her occupations before going to bed should be quiet ones.

Pray do not regard my advice as that of a theorist. I think you will see that the results of my regimen have proved to be eminently practical.

To Richard Potter.

7 February, 1889.

You speak of having been to Yew Tree. I well remember my visit there in 1848—remember, too, my first meeting with you there, and further remember that I thought you the most gentlemanly young fellow I had ever seen. I have heard you speak disparagingly of yourself in early days, but your self-depreciation is all nonsense.

I should be very glad could I visit you at the Argoed in the summer, but I see little chance of doing so. . . . However, there is no knowing what may happen.

About the middle of March, 1889, he returned to London. "Save some additions to the *Autobiography*," writes Mr. Troughton, "the nine months' stay at Dorking were barren of achievement in the way of serious work." Wishing to be near the Athenæum, he stayed for a short time at a private Hotel in St. James' Place. Early in April he was back at Queen's Gardens worry-

ing himself over a statement of Rev. Dr. J. Wilson's in the *Aberdeen Free Press* that in 1844, when on the staff of the Birmingham *Pilot,* he wrote articles for that paper on "Sociology." The reading of this gave him a "disagreeable shock," as bearing on his relation to Comte, and led to correspondence with Dr. Wilson, which left "the matter in a muddle" owing to Dr. Wilson's memory being "treacherous." In this emergency he turned for help to Mr. Frederic Harrison, who was requested to be good enough to send some one to the British Museum to examine the entire file of the short-lived *Pilot,* and make a copy of the titles of all the leading articles. Mr. Harrison thought such a search unnecessary. "Your contention is so clearly right, and Mr. Wilson's memory so obviously untrustworthy as against yours, that I should think your denial in a brief letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette* would be ample, and would satisfy every one." Spencer, however, repeated his request to have the file examined. On this being done, a letter was sent to the *Pall Mall Gazette,* showing how unfounded Dr. Wilson's statements were.

On his 69th birthday he penned what he probably regarded at the time as the closing paragraphs of the *Autobiography* (ii., 485). In May he wrote the preface to Mr. Collins's *Epitome,* about which there had been correspondence during the previous ten months—correspondence showing how anxious he was to keep clear of all implications of responsibility for that work. "You can adopt what size, style, and type, &c., you please. In respect of binding, however, I should wish the independence of the volume manifest."

There came a pressing invitation from Mr. Manton

Marble, that he would spend three months next winter with him and his wife on their dahabeah on the Nile. "We can offer you spacious, comfortable quarters (which implies solitude as much as you like), an excellent table, absolute freedom from cost or care, lazy days and quiet nights. . . . If you have a favourite tipple or a special food we will procure them; if you have a favourite game we will learn it; when you would be let alone we will ignore your existence; when you would bestow your tediousness upon us we will give it welcome. . . . Were you to become disappointed in any way, or weary and prefer return, Cook and Son's steamers would always afford easy escape." Spencer could only regret that his health precluded acceptance of this generous offer. He was about this time reminded of the qualified answer given in February to an invitation to come to the Argoed, in Monmouthshire.

To Richard Potter.

28 *May*, 1889.

Would that it were possible for me to yield to your kind pressure and visit the Argoed, but unhappily it is quite out of the question. . . .

How likely I should be to visit you, if I dared, you may judge by the fact that I am at present advertising for country quarters during the summer months. . . . Even did I find some place that met my requirements in other respects there would still be lacking that which I above all things want—the companionship of those I care about. You may judge then how gladly I would come to the Argoed if I could get there.

There was no lack of replies to his advertisement for summer quarters, but his numerous and peculiar re-

quirements were not easily met. Armed with a long list of points to be considered, his secretary was sent hither and thither, taking notes of the house and its inmates; the proximity of poultry, dogs, church bells, railways; the salubrity of the air and the resources of the surrounding country for drives, &c. "Curiously enough," says Mr. Troughton, "after a series of disappointments, the last reply to the advertisements brought the desired haven of rest. At a place near Pewsey, in Wiltshire, I found a habitat which answered almost perfectly to what was wanted." Meanwhile, tired of boarding house life, he was on the look out for a permanent house of his own in London. In due course he was introduced to the Misses ——, with whom an arrangement was come to and a house in Avenue Road, Regent's Park, was chosen.

To John Tyndall.

12 *June*, 1889.

I have found a place in Wiltshire which promises to serve me pretty well for my summer months; . . . They asked for references and I ventured to name you as one. . . . I end with a startling fact:—I have taken a house in St. John's Wood, and am going to have three maiden ladies to take care of me! This is in pursuance of an idea I have contemplated for nearly a year.

While he was at Pewsey there appeared Tenniel's cartoon in *Punch* of 17 August—"Out in the Cold," in which the First Lord of the Treasury, glancing over the Pension List, says to Unfortunate Genius: "Let me see; Civil List—Literature, Science, and Art! H'm! I'm afraid, my poor friend, you're hardly eligible. You're

not a Foreign Prince, nor a titled Poet, nor the relative of an Ambassador or Policeman—." To this Spencer attached the following memorandum:—

I am rejoiced to see this cartoon. It ought to make Tennyson wince. To my thinking he has been disgraced for these many years past by continuing to receive a pension, when he had no longer any need of it—to receive it, too, out of a small fund intended for necessitous men of letters and science, and quite inadequate to meet the legitimate claims upon it, (if any such claims are, as a matter of public policy, to be regarded as legitimate).

The pension which Tennyson has continued to receive was given to him when a young man and before he met with much public recognition, and at a time when, as I was told, loss of nearly all he possessed in an imprudent speculation put him into difficulties; so that, at that time, there was, if such pensions are to be given at all, a valid reason for giving him one. He has continued to retain this pension up to his 80th year, notwithstanding the fact that for these many years past he has been a comparatively wealthy man—so wealthy as to be able to have two country houses. I believe his works bring him in several thousands a year, which in fact, is implied by the style of his living. So that he has continued to retain this pension, when he was perfectly able to dispense with it, and has, by doing so, withheld it from some more or less meritorious person who was in real need.

What a contrast is afforded by the conduct of Harriet Martineau, who, although without other means than such as she obtained by hard work with her pen, and enabled by that hard work only to achieve a small income, nevertheless when a pension was offered to her, refused it—preferred rather to continue her hard work, and a moderate pittance, than receive any public money—

probably disapproving of expenditure of public money for such purposes.

The antithesis is a strange one between this nobility of the political economist, who is supposed to be by nature hard and prosaic, and the meanness of the poet supposed to be by nature so noble in feeling.

My admiration for Tennyson has been, for these many years past, largely discounted by the consciousness of this conduct of his.

To T. H. Huxley.

28 *September,* 1889.

And so you are building a house at Eastbourne, I hear. I thought that even *taking* a house at my age was rather an eccentric proceeding, after having all my life lived in lodgings or in a boarding-house, but that you should be at your age *building* one suffices to make me feel that I am not so eccentric after all. . . .

How are you after your sojourn in Switzerland? Though I heard of your call I did not hear of your health. I hope you profited as before, and that you have come back in good training for another bout of fisticuffs with the theologians.

The progress of evolutionary ideas on the continent during the years covered by this chapter was not striking. To keep alive the interest in his philosophy, to say nothing of increasing it, new works from his pen were needed, but since the publication of "The Factors of Organic Evolution" early in 1886 there had been nothing to arrest the attention of foreigners, and to remind them that he was still a living force. But in 1888 he was embarrassed on hearing that, on the occasion of the eighth centenary of the University of Bologna, he had been made a Doctor of the Juridical Faculty. Re-

plying to Signor Tullio Martello he said he was glad to thus receive a clear verification of the belief that his books had obtained considerable acceptance in Italy. The election had, however, placed him in an awkward position. Up to the present time he had habitually declined all honorary degrees and academic honours; and from the position he had taken up it was difficult to retreat. On the other hand, the flattering manner in which the authorities of the University of Bologna had conferred the degree made it difficult for him to decline without appearing to slight this expression of their appreciation. "Thus, you will see, that between my feelings and convictions I am placed in a dilemma from which there appears to be no escape."

Early in the following year he found himself in a similar predicament, on learning that the Royal Danish Academy had elected him a member. With his letter to Professor Höffding declining the honour, he sent a copy of his letter to the French Academy, which, he said, "will show the Council of the Royal Danish Academy what my reasons are, and that it is not from undervaluing the honour they have conferred that I take the course I do."[1]

[1] *Supra,* chap. xvii., p. 311.

CHAPTER XX

IN DEFENCE OF FREEDOM AND JUSTICE

(*September,* 1889—*December,* 1891)

He had looked forward to uninterrupted progress with the *Ethics,* and was disappointed to find how much of his time was used up by matters which did not advance his undertaking. Delay in getting the lease of his house drawn up and signed led him to write to the owner: "It seems to me that a lawyer who does business in this style ought to lose his clients." The turn of landlords for reproof came in a letter to his solicitor on observing that a clause restricting his liabilities for repairs had not been inserted. "The fact that there was not any such clause—and I suppose there is habitually no such clause—shows how abominably the interests of the landlord alone are considered, and those of the tenant ignored." He began to accept invitations to evening parties—a thing he had not done for several years. His old interest in the affairs of the Athenæum revived. Wishing habitual diners to be represented on the Committee, he urged a fellow member to take the matter up. "I don't like to raise the question myself. . . . I am well known to the manager as a very candid critic, who is continually asking for his attendance to receive complaints, and I do not want to become more objectionable than I am." He was instrumental in getting Mr. (now Baron) Kentaro Kaneko, the Japa-

nese statesman, made an honorary member of the Club in the spring of 1890. This was the beginning of their personal acquaintance. Familiarity with Spencer's writings dated back some years, Count Ito and Mr. Kaneko having made a careful study of his books during the five years they were engaged in revising the Japanese Constitution. In the following year, after returning to Japan, Mr. Kaneko solicited Spencer's advice on the problem his country was trying to solve:—"Whether Asiatic nations can come into the circle of European Constitutional States."

When account is taken of the fever of excitement that overtook him at the end of 1889,[1] one can read between the lines of the following New Year's greeting and realise that it was not a mere form of words when he said that he envied the equanimity and cheerfulness of his friend.

To Richard Potter.

29 *December*, 1889.

My Dear Old Friend,—I send you a New Year's greeting along with my best wishes for your recovery from the serious relapse you have been suffering under.

Letters from one or other of the family have from time to time given me news of you which, unsatisfactory in so far as the continuance of your feeble state is concerned, have yet been satisfactory in telling of your continued cheerfulness. It is an immense thing to have so happy a nature. To have so long preserved not only a state of equanimity and content, but to have found more pleasure during invalid life than most persons find during health, is an achievement not reached by one in a hundred or perhaps one in a thousand. In

[1] See chap. xxii., vol. ii., p. 26.

this respect I envy you your nature as well as your family surroundings.

From Miss Youmans.

30 *March*, 1890.

Last Sunday [23 March] the *New York Times* published something like an attack upon you, and called attention editorially to the article. To-day your defenders have their say; and I send you both series of articles. . . . There are various conjectures as to the reason of this start of the *New York Times*. Jay [her brother] thinks it is only a newspaper dodge to attract attention. Others imagine that there is a concerted movement to crush you over again. If this is the idea, it certainly looks discouraging for the attacking party.

Whether this was "a newspaper dodge" or a deliberate attack, Spencer thought it expedient to take notice of it, and wrote to Mr. Skilton, Secretary of the Brooklyn Ethical Association.

To James A. Skilton.

8 *April*, 1890.

It is, I think, needful that the letter of "Outsider" and the editorial article upon it should be met. . . .

I enclose the draft of a letter which I think might fitly be sent to the *New York Times*. . . . I presume you are acquainted with Dr. W. J. Youmans, and I think it would be well to consult him. Probably if he were to undertake the reply . . . it would be the best. Standing as he does in closer relations to my affairs in the United States, through his intimate knowledge of all his brother has done, and being, therefore, publicly understood to be more fully in possession of the facts than any one else, the letter might with advantage issue from him, if he consents.

"Outsider's" letter was a revival of the question raised in the *Nation* twenty years before as to Spencer's reputation among specialists.[1] Of the letters published up to 6th April, only one could be considered adverse. The editor felt constrained to ask: "Where are the foes of Spencer?" "Outsider" intervened to say: "Let it not be supposed that I am attacking Spencerianism. . . . At present I am only seeking light." Following upon other letters, mostly favourable, the issue of 27th April—Spencer's birthday—was signalised by one from Dr. W. J. Youmans, giving "Outsider" the light he sought. Summing up the discussion the editor remarked: "While Mr. Spencer's *Synthetic Philosophy* is still an ardent controversy, it may fairly be claimed by his adherents that his assailants have suffered more damage than he or his system in the contest that has raged around him during the last thirty years." In the issue of 4th May, "Outsider" admitted that Dr. W. J. Youmans's letter, "without of course sufficing to put his [Spencer's] philosophy beyond doubt, does satisfactorily answer the question to which I gave special prominence." With the discussion which thus closed on his seventieth birthday Spencer had no reason to be dissatisfied. A resolution passed by the Brooklyn Ethical Association also afforded him much gratification.

To James A. Skilton.

10 *May*, 1890.

Those who in the past have devoted their lives to the diffusion of ideas have usually had much to suffer and have met with little appreciation during their lives. Re-

[1] *Supra*, chap. xii., p. 198.

membering the fates of such, I may regard myself as extremely fortunate. If, during the first half of my literary career, the losses were great and the encouragements small, yet the latter half has made amends; and I may well be more than satisfied alike with the material results and the effects produced, as well as with the marks of appreciation which have been coming to me more and more frequently.

Of all his undertakings the most disappointing had been the *Descriptive Sociology*. But even that cloud was not without a bit of silver lining. From time to time he received from Mr. E. T. C. Werner, of H.B.M. Consular Service in China, encouraging reports of the progress of the Descriptive Sociology of the Chinese, which Mr. Werner had voluntarily undertaken to prepare, without cost to Spencer, as far as compilation was concerned. In carrying on this work[1] Mr. Werner had much to contend against: heavy and often vexatious official duties, an exhausting climate, ill-health, &c.—hindrances which would have led one less enthusiastic to have given up the self-imposed task as impracticable. Of Mr. Werner's unselfish devotion to the work Spencer often spoke with much appreciation. It was another of the things which he said cheered him at a time of life when cheering things were not very common.

During the spring he completed for *Mind* an article on "Space Consciousness," which had been lying over since 1883. In view of a final edition of the *Essays*, he also wrote a postscript to "The Origin and Function of Music," which appeared in *Mind* for October.

The receipt of a copy of the late Miss Constance

[1] Now (1908) nearing completion.

Naden's *Induction and Deduction* afforded him an opportunity of reiterating his long-formed convictions regarding the intellectual powers of women.

To Robert Lewins.

Pewsey, 10 *June*, 1890.

Very generally receptivity and originality are not associated, but in her they appear to have been equally great. I can tell you of no woman save George Eliot in whom there has been this union of high philosophical capacity with extensive acquisition. . . . While I say this, however, I cannot let pass the occasion for remarking that, in her case as in other cases, mental powers so highly developed in women are in some measure abnormal and involve a physiological cost which the feminine organisation will not bear without injury more or less profound.

He was on what he thought more uncertain ground when consulted by Mr. Malabari, of Bombay, on the subject of early marriage in India.

To Behramji M. Malabari.

20 *July*, 1890.

Although I have not studied Indian affairs to any extent I can understand the difficulty felt by Anglo-Indian authorities in dealing with questions like that which you raise. Doubtless they are impressed, and in a large measure rightly impressed, with the belief that it is impolitic for one race to interfere with the customs of another race, the character and feelings of which are in a considerable degree incomprehensible to it. Certainly it is a mistake to assume, as many do, that the institutions found good for one people will be good for another, and it is the perception of this mistake that causes the inaction of the Indian Government. . . .

I incline to agree with you, however, that the passivity of the Government in relation to native usages may be carried too far. Marriage is rightly to be regarded as a contract. A contract implies unconstrained assent of the contracting parties, and it implies also that they shall be of such age as to be capable of understanding the responsibilities to which the contract commits them. . . . In neither of these respects does the Indian usage fulfil the requirements. The union is not the result of a voluntary contract, and those who enter into it are not of fit age to make it even though voluntary.

It may be a question whether under such circumstances the State may not go to the extent of ignoring the contract, and declining to administer in all matters concerning it or growing out of it. . . .

Whether this would or would not be too strong a measure can be decided only by those who know more of the conditions of things in India than I do.

To Professor Tyndall.

22 *August,* 1890.

Unless the Alps have been in an island of good weather amidst the ocean of bad weather which seems to have pervaded pretty nearly the whole of the northern hemisphere, or at any rate the eastern half of it, I fear you have had a great deal of monotonous indoor life in your alpine *châlet.* . . . You have not, I fancy, that faculty for idleness which I have, and, if prevented from going out, are obliged to busy yourself about something, instead of lounging about and letting your nervous system lie fallow as I do. . . .

I recently had with me again for three weeks my little friends, the children of Mrs. [W. H.] Cripps. . . . One of them, a little girl of 10, is organically good, and like another of the same sex of whom I have heard, gives one hopes of the possibilities of human nature.

A small society at Oxford being about to discuss what Dr. Arnold called "the best authenticated fact in history,"—the Resurrection—and recognising that their "Theological Bias" led them to underestimate the difficulties in the way of accepting it, they requested Spencer to put down the main reasons for honestly doubting the fact.

To W. A. H. C. Freemantle.

29 *October,* 1890.

Naturally I am interested in your letter telling me of the effects made by reading the *Study of Sociology* by your friend and yourself. Its aims were altogether social and political, and it never occurred to me that it might have any theological influence. . . .

But though it is out of the question for me to furnish you with direct reasons for doubt, I can furnish you with some indirect reasons of a sufficiently weighty kind. I can give you from my own experience four instances which have occurred during the last twenty years, showing the extreme untrustworthiness of human testimony. [The four unfounded statements were that he was present at the funeral of Mr. Odger, at the unveiling of the memorial statue to Mr. Fawcett, at the funeral of Lord and Lady Dalhousie, and that he had written articles on Sociology for the Birmingham *Pilot.*] Here then are the testimonies of eye-witnesses, ordinarily to be regarded as conclusive evidence. And all this occurred within a period covering but a fourth part of my life, and in an age of the world when men are more critical and less credulous than they were two thousand years ago. As there is no reason for supposing that my experiences of the invalidity of testimony are peculiar, it is manifest that there must be multitudinous cases daily occurring of apparent clear proofs which are not

proofs.[1] If so, what are the probabilities respecting the testimony on which you rely for believing in these alleged breaches of the order of nature?

The credibility of testimony was again touched upon the month following, on one of the numerous occasions when the " billiard story " was going the rounds.

To Miss Beatrice Potter.

20 *November*, 1890.

When you meet with a newspaper statement about me extract the square root and that will give you about the ratio of the fact to the fiction in it. I have not been in the Senior United Service Club for five years, and I never played any such game as that described, nor ever made any such remark *à propos* of one. The sole basis of truth in it is that I have occasionally repeated as the saying of a friend of mine, that to play billiards well is a sign of an ill-spent youth. All the rest is dressing.

The billiard story which year after year went the round of the press, with slight variations to suit the tastes of different classes of readers, is a striking example of the wonderful perversions these gossiping stories undergo. Some six or seven months before Spencer's death it appeared in *T. P.'s Weekly* (13 May, 1903), the scene being laid this time not in the United Service Club, but in the Athenæum. At the request of the present writer Spencer dictated to his secretary the following:

[1] Such as the statement made to the present writer in 1898 by a Jesuit father who had been informed by a Jesuit priest who had recently been at St. Leonards and knew Spencer "that Herbert Spencer had become a strict ritualist."

One afternoon some ten years ago, when seated in the billiard room of the Athenæum Club, it was remarked to me by the late Mr. Charles Roupell (an Official Referee of the High Court of Justice) that to play billiards well was a sign of an ill-spent youth. Whether there was or was not any game going on at the time I cannot remember, but I am sure he would not have made a remark in any way offensive to any one in the room.

In the course of that autumn or a subsequent autumn, when we had our interchange of visits with the United Service Club opposite, I repeated this saying of Roupell's—*repeated*, I say, not giving any implication that it was an idea of my own, and most positively not making it in reference either to any game I was playing or had played, or in reference to games played by any one else: it was absolutely dissociated from anybody, and was simply uttered by me as an abstract proposition. This abstract proposition presently made its appearance in, I presume, one or other evening paper. In the first version, I think a young Major was the other party to the story. Then from time to time it went the round of the papers, and having dropped for a while, reappeared in other papers (provincial included), always with variations and additions: the result being a cock-and-bull story, having no basis whatever further than the fact that I once repeated this saying of Roupell's apropos of nobody.[1]

---

[1] One of the most absurd editions of the story appeared in *The Golden Penny* of 29 April, 1899. The game had gone against him. "Mr. Spencer's brow clouded. 'Sir,' he said, as the marker hastily scrambled under the table to allow uninterrupted discussion, 'moderate proficiency is a sign of a good education of the eye, the nerve, the hand: but your mastership of the game could have been acquired only by an ill-spent youth.' The philosopher was quite calm and collected, and not at all angry; he merely broke his cue to see whether it was made of elm or oak, and found, as he had expected, that it was neither." Truly, a wonderful growth of a myth!

The Liberty and Property Defence League claimed his sympathy in virtue of the resistance it made to socialistic legislation. But, he informed the secretary in February, 1890: "Though I am quite willing to aid pecuniarily, I am desirous that my aid should not be publicly interpreted into membership of the League." In succeeding years his faith in it was shaken, owing to its having become, as he thought, an organisation for upholding property rather than liberty. In 1890, however, he still had faith in it, and sought to turn it to account in resistance to the growing burdens and encroachments of municipal bodies.

To the Earl of Wemyss.

Pewsey, 10 *June*, 1890.

I have for some time past been looking for signs of resistance to be presently made by the over-taxed citizens of London. . . . Both on the part of the School Board and the County Council the movements are going in the direction which Mr. Henry George indicates as the right one—not to turn out the landlords, but to tax them out. Let but the existing socialistic policy be carried further and further, as it seems likely to be, and the revenues from property will be gradually swallowed up by public demands.

I write to you, thinking that the Liberty and Property Defence League might very properly initiate a resistance to the extravagant measures daily taken by these local governing bodies.

A month or two later his help was sought for a projected volume of anti-socialist essays. On the ground that the book was an attempt to apply his own principles, he was appealed to, through Lord Wemyss, to do "what would be the making of this volume." Yielding

to the pressure put upon him, he promised to write an Introduction, but he in his turn was not so successful in getting Lord Wemyss to contribute.

To the Earl of Wemyss.

14 *November,* 1890.

As you pressed me into the ranks of the anti-socialist demonstration and I have yielded to your pressure, I have a certain claim to similarly press you.

I should be very glad if you would wind up the discussion by a brief paper, . . . emphasising the truth which people so persistently ignore, that every step away from individualism is a step towards socialism, and that by repetition of such steps, socialism must inevitably be reached. Habitually the supporters of each muddling measure, . . . persist in thinking only of that particular measure, . . . and shut their eyes to the fact that multiplication of such measures year after year brings us nearer and nearer to that result which they, in common with others, profess to look upon with dread.

While sympathising with the Hon. Auberon Herbert's project for a newspaper—*Free Life*—to advocate individualism, he expressed the fear that it would "entail considerable loss, and abandonment after a very short life."

To the Hon. Auberon Herbert.

1 *January,* 1890.

Of course you will put down my name as a subscriber.

I say this without committing myself to agreement in respect of all points in your programme. From Home Rule, for example, I utterly dissent. All nations have been welded together not by peaceful and equitable means, but by violent and inequitable means, and I do not believe that nations could ever have been formed

in any other way. To dissolve unions because they were inequitably formed I hold, now that they have been formed, to be a mistake—a retrograde step. Were it possible to go back upon the past and undo all the bad things that have been done, society would forthwith dissolve.

16 *June.*—I am myself almost hopeless of any good to be done [towards promoting individualism]. The drift of things is so overwhelming in the other direction, and the stream will, I believe, continue to increase in volume and velocity, simply because political power is now in the hands of those whose *apparent* interest is to get as much as possible done by public agency, and whose desires will be inevitably pandered to by all who seek public functions.

5 *October.*—I regret to see that *Free Life* is assuming what seems to me an unattractive aspect. When you initiated your scheme and made a commencement I did not expect much result, though, of course, I sympathised in every effort in the direction of individualism. I feared, too, that your doctrine of voluntary taxation would go very much against success, and, indeed, prejudice the individualist doctrine in general. . . .

Still as you continue your efforts in your original form, it seems to me best that they shall be made as effective as possible, and I am prompted to write expressing my regret that your form of presentation is less attractive than it was. The last number of *Free Life* is comparatively uninteresting in appearance—lacking sub-divisions and proper headings. In fact, while our press generally has been Americanising the mode of editing in, as I think, an improper manner, you seem to be going in the other direction and discarding all elements of attraction.

22 *October.*—I think you are writing, or probably have written, an essay on the Ethics of Liberty, to be in-

cluded in this volume of anti-socialist essays. Remembering what you said in a recent letter concerning your views on voluntary taxation—that you should presently furnish me with your defence—it occurs to me that this defence will possibly be contained in this essay. I hope this is not the case. If your essay contains these special views of yours they are sure to be commented upon as impracticable, and will be used as a handle against the doctrines contained in the volume as a whole. . . .

Will you forgive me if I say that you do not sufficiently bear in mind the *organic* badness of existing human nature and the resulting *organic* badness of any society organised out of existing human nature. As I have elsewhere said, you cannot get golden conduct out of leaden instincts; and men's instincts are at present in large measure leaden. Year by year and day by day [events] convince me more and more that there is only a certain amount of liberty of which men having a given nature are capable, and if a larger amount of liberty is given to them they will quickly lose it by organising for themselves some other form of tyranny. This is what is now going on. They have got by sundry electoral reforms more liberty than they are capable of using, and the result is that they are organising for themselves the tyrannies of trade-unionism, and socialism, and socialistic legislation, which will [end by] putting them as much in bondage as before, if not more than before. Such being their natures, it is to me clear that they are far from being good enough for any such régime as that which you advocate.

When men are good enough for a system of voluntary taxation they will be good enough to do without any government at all.

"From Freedom to Bondage" was the heading chosen for his Introduction to *A Plea for Liberty*, under which title the volume of anti-socialist essays ap-

peared at the beginning of 1891. As to portions of the Introduction, wrote Mr. Gladstone, "I ask to make reserves, and of one passage, which will be easily guessed, I am unable even to perceive the relevancy. But speaking generally, I have read this masterly argument with warm admiration and with the earnest hope that it may attract all the attention which it so well deserves." The passage alluded to was that in which reference was made to "the behaviour of the so-called Liberal party." Spencer thought it "not unnatural that Mr. Gladstone should disapprove of the passage to which he refers, but it is curious that he should fail to see its relevancy." Spencer's share of the profits of the volume was returned to Mr. Murray to be spent in distributing copies to Free Libraries and Reading Rooms.

He had for some time been urging the formation of an association for the defence of the interests of ratepayers. To secure a really effective protest he urged the merging of existing local ratepayers' leagues in the larger and more powerful one he wished to see formed, the policy of which should be directed more especially to the choice of members of the County Council and the School Board. His efforts were at length crowned with success, "The London Ratepayers' Defence League" being formed in August, 1891.[1]

Interferences with individual liberty, either by the State or by local authorities or associations, were detected in the most innocent-looking proposals, as when he was solicited by the Hon. Auberon Herbert to co-operate in a movement for ensuring better ventilation in dwelling-houses.

[1] *Standard*, August 20.

To the Hon. Auberon Herbert.

14 *May*, 1891.

My belief is that far more mischief in the shape of cold or rheumatism results from draughts than from the breathing of air that is not quite pure, and that these evils would be greatly increased by further use of any of the ordinary measures for ventilation—measures which are habitually used in such ways as to entail serious danger. . . . But whatever may be the truth of the matter, one thing is quite clear—that your movement will inevitably be used in furtherance of State meddling notwithstanding the protest you make. I regret that I cannot in this matter co-operate with you.

Scientific scepticism, as in the above instance, often came to the aid of political disapproval. Declining to sign a memorial regarding rabies in the spring of 1890, he expressed himself as "sceptical with regard both to the present scare about rabies and the alleged specific for it." So it was with regard to vaccination. "Compulsory vaccination I detest, and voluntary vaccination I disapprove."

That one so fond of children should be made to appear as an opponent of measures for preventing cruelty towards them seems anomalous—but only so long as his thoroughgoing individualism is overlooked. A few remarks made by him at a drawing-room meeting at the house of the Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley, in connexion with the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, were, to his great surprise, published in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Had he anticipated that his unpremeditated remarks were to be made public he would, he wrote, have taken care to emphasise more strongly the dangers which are likely to arise—illegitimate interfer-

ence with parents, and a very objectionable system of intrusion into the domestic circle.[1]

The questions involved (he wrote again) are far-reaching—touching, indeed, some ultimate problems of social life. . . . More and more the tendency is to absolve parents from their responsibilities, and to saddle these responsibilities on the community. . . .

It is surprising with what light hearts people are led to abrogate the order of Nature and to substitute an order of their own devising. . . . And now it has come to be thought that these strong parental feelings . . . may with advantage be replaced by public sentiment working through State-machinery! . . .

Respecting the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, the question is—Will it work towards the enforcing of parental responsibilities or towards the undermining of them? To bring punishment on brutal and negligent parents seems, on the whole, a beneficial function. . . . Unfortunately, very innocent looking germs are apt to develop into structures which are anything but innocent.[2]

To the Hon. George C. Brodrick.

10 *May,* 1891.

I am much obliged to you for the copy of your *Collected Essays and Speeches.* . . . They contain a great mass of information and much sound reasoning, and already they have suggested to me a useful thought.

I am giving some illustrations of the numerous unexpected effects which a social cause eventually produces, and one of your essays reminds me of an instance, namely the effect that has been produced by the endeavour of landlords to control the votes of their tenants. This, I conceive, was the cause of short leases, and short

[1] *Pall Mall Gazette,* 16 May, 1891.
[2] *Pall Mall Gazette,* 28 May, 1891.

leases have disastrously affected the investment of capital in land, and by so doing diminished its productiveness; and now it appears that this cause, joined with others, is initiating, through the farmers of land, the disastrous interferences with contract, which will itself bring on multitudinous evils. . . .

There is a kindred instance of the vitiating of social arrangements by illegitimate efforts to obtain political power in the effects of the rating clauses as they affect small tenements, the rates of which are paid by the landlords. The dissociation of political power from the conscious bearing of political burdens is working out most disastrous, and, indeed, revolutionary effects.

These were some of the chief lessons of the newly-published volume on "Justice."

In June he was the recipient of an unexpected gift.

To Andrew Carnegie.

20 June, 1891.

I was alike astonished and perplexed on entering my room yesterday evening to see placed against the wall a magnificent grand piano, which was not there when I left home. For some time I was too much possessed by the surprising fact to have any coherent thoughts about its possible source. . . .

Well, I cannot do more than thank you heartily for so splendid a gift, which, daily before my eyes, cannot fail to bring you often to my thoughts. I have all along sympathised in your view respecting the uses of wealth, but it never occurred to me that I should benefit by the carrying of your view into practice. Leaving out all other considerations, what an immensity of satisfaction of a high kind is obtained by its distribution during life, as compared with the pleasure obtained by one who heaps up and bequeaths. You are much to be

envied for having the opportunity of so often and so largely experiencing this pleasure.

I hear that there is presently coming a selection of classical music, for which also thanks.

The correspondence with Professor Tyndall during 1891 was very voluminous. The first of the extracts now to be given relates to a visit to Hind Head House, Haslemere, the residence of Professor and Mrs. Tyndall, which fell through; and the concluding one to a visit which did take place, and was memorable also as being the occasion on which the two friends met for the last time.

To John Tyndall.

24 *February*, 1891.

Yesterday I wrote to the Station-master at Haslemere, asking him to order a cab to meet the 1 o'clock train and carry me up to Hind Head House. But as I lay awake last night, contemplating the four carriage drives and two railway journeys, I became impressed with the probability that a serious relapse would result from the expedition if I undertook it, and so, this morning I telegraphed a countermand.

I have been shocked to hear from Hirst of your having again to take to your bed in consequence of a second illness. . . . Let me urge you not to confine yourself to mutton and chicken. It is getting rather late for game, but partridges and pheasants are still to be had, and then in default of these, there are prairie hens from America, and ptarmigan from Norway. Wild ducks, too, I find digestible; and then there are pigeons and quails. Not only is variety in kinds of food desirable, but also in cooking.

1 *April*.—There is a wide difference between physical precipices and physiological precipices, and a head that

may be fully trusted among the first may not be quite so trustworthy among the last.

2 *April.*—Yesterday afternoon Hirst gave me your postcard to read, and we exchanged expressions of pleasure at the improved prospects: thinking that the change for the better was so marked that rapid recovery might be expected. Shortly afterwards I took a postcard and wrote upon it, half in jest, half in earnest, the warning. I have been several days thinking of doing this, because it seemed to me that you were running risks that should be avoided.

4 *April.*—I have all along been fearful that your habit, so long cultivated, of successful daring, would tend to make you do things that are not prudent.

A renewed intention of visiting Hind Head just before going to Wiltshire was defeated by "an accumulation of excitements which put me quite wrong." The chief cause of this was that "I had foolishly let myself be entangled by an American interviewer, and on Friday afternoon I had an hour and a half's sharp work in revising his report."[1]

To John Tyndall.

Pewsey, 4 *July,* 1891.

I hope you have progressed sufficiently to be out of doors, and that you are enjoying the summer's day as I am doing now, with larks singing overhead—an umbrella to keep off the excess of sun—and a young lady playing the part of amanuensis.

1 *September.*—On the 11th instant I leave this and, instead of going straight back to town, make a *détour.*

[1] This refers probably to a report of an interview with Spencer, which was published in the New York *Mail and Express* of October 5, 1891.

I have promised to spend a week at Mottisfont Abbey, the country place of my friends the Meinertzhagens. . . . When I leave Mottisfont, somewhere about the 18th, I propose to try and see you wherever you may be. If, as I suggested, you have gone to the Isle of Wight, or shall have gone there before the 18th, then I can, from Southampton, easily pass over to see you there; but if you continue at Hind Head, I can, by a somewhat round-about journey get to you there, and, if it is convenient, spend a night at your house.

The promised visit was paid at Hind Head. The letters, from which the above extracts have been taken, throw light upon certain traits of Spencer's character, showing how erroneous was the impression that his solicitude about his own health had its root in selfishness. True it is that his own ailments are diagnosed, their causes investigated, and the action of remedies traced with a tedious minuteness and frequency. But it is precisely the same with regard to the illnesses of his friends. His concern about himself, when placed side by side with his concern for others, is seen to have its source in an intellectual dissatisfaction which gave him no rest until he had probed every question to the bottom, and a sympathetic impulse which compelled him whenever he saw anything wrong to try to put it right.

To Robert Buchanan.

7 *October*, 1891.

Only yesterday did I finish *The Outcast*. . . . I read through very few books, so you may infer that I derived much pleasure. There are many passages of great beauty and many others of great vigour, and speaking at large, I admire greatly your fertile and varied expression. One thing in it which I like much is the way

LOCH ALINE, ARGYLLSHIRE,
With ruins of Kinlochaline Castle in the distance.

in which the story is presented in varied forms as well as under various aspects.

One thing I wish you had done, which I have often contended should be done, namely, make the mode of expression vary with the subject matter and feeling, rising from rhythmical prose up to the most concentrated lyric. Long poems to me almost always seem monotonous, and the monotony is in large measure due to the uniformity in the style and versification. In style you have in this poem been varied enough, but I should have liked to see greater variety of versification. As a matter of art, too, if you will allow me to make such a suggestion, I should say that there is a tendency to redundancy, especially in descriptive passages. Your fertile imagination I think needs controlling by a tighter rein. . . .

I wish you would presently undertake a satire on the times. There is an immensity of matter calling for strong denunciation and display of white-hot anger, and I think you are well capable of dealing with the signs of our times. More especially I want some one, who has the ability to do it with sufficient intensity of feeling, to denounce the miserable hypocrisy of our religious world with its pretended observance of Christian principles side by side with the abominations which it continually commits and countenances abroad. It might very well be symbolised as " The Impenitent Thief," and I should like you to nail it to the cross.

In our political life, too, there are multitudinous things which invite severest castigation—the morals of party strife and the way in which men are, with utter insincerity, sacrificing their convictions for the sake of political and social position, careless of the mischief which they are doing. I wish you would think this over.

Some weeks before this on reading Mr. Buchanan's notice of " Justice," he had written to the same effect.

I am glad you have taken occasion to denounce the hypocrisy of the Christian world; ceaseless in its professions of obedience to the principles of its creed, and daily trampling upon them in all parts of the world. I wish you would seize every occasion which occurs (and there are plenty of them) for holding up a mirror, and showing to those who call themselves Christians that they are morally pagans.

When towards the end of 1889 the Hon. Auberon Herbert suggested a new issue of *Social Statics,* Spencer pointed out that " Justice " would be a revised and fully matured exposition of the systematic part of that book. As for the rest of the book, he proposed to select such portions of it as seemed worth preserving, and to publish this abridgment and *The Man* versus *The State* as one volume. In this revision of his first book two main considerations guided him—the omission or modification of passages that no longer expressed his matured convictions, and the omission of parts treated more systematically in the *Principles of Ethics. Pari passu,* therefore, with the writing of " Justice " had proceeded these alterations in *Social Statics;* and as soon as " Justice " was published, he took steps to bring out this composite volume.

At the beginning of the year, when Mrs. Craig-Sellar had recalled to his memory the old times at Ardtornish, he had said: " I am glad to think that among those who peopled past scenes I figure as one not unpleasantly recollected. As the steamer brought me away for the last time in August, 1883, I remember looking with melancholy eyes on the Ardtornish cliffs and thinking that I should never again see them—a presentiment which has

ARDTORNISH HOUSE, LOCH ALINE.

Pulled down in 1883.

proved true.'' Those delightful bygone days were again brought to his remembrance towards the close of the year.

To Miss Flora Smith.

22 *November,* 1891.

You could scarcely have found a present giving me greater pleasure than did the four framed photographs you sent me yesterday: partly because of their intrinsic interest and partly because they came from you.

I have got admirable places for them. The portraits, fixed on each side of the mirror in my bedroom, will remind me of my highly valued friends every morning when I wake; and the two landscapes, displacing two chromo-lithographs in my study, will face me daily as I work—so recalling the scenes in which my happiest days have been passed.

To W. Valentine Smith.

18 *December,* 1891.

About three weeks ago I was pleased to have the company of your sisters here: Mrs. Sellar and children came to luncheon and Miss Smith shortly afterwards. She came prepared to fulfil a promise which she had made some time since to sing to me once again Tennyson's '' Farewell,'' [1] which I so well remember as having heard on the occasion of my first visit to Achranich.

His aunt Anna was now the only link connecting him with his boyhood and youth. Writing to her in August he mentions the state of extreme prostration to which Mr. Richard Potter had been reduced by his long illness, and looks forward with deep sorrow to the ap-

[1] Set to music by Edward Lear. Spencer was very fond of the song, and often asked Miss Flora Smith to sing it to him.

proaching termination of a friendship that had remained without a jar for about half a century, and that was interwoven with most of the leading events of his life. It carried his thoughts back to 1842, when he first became acquainted with Mrs. Potter's father—Mr. Lawrence Heyworth—whose great-grandchildren were now contributing to his happiness. The friendship now nearing its close had all along rested on genuine human affection and mutual esteem—not on community of ideas; for Mr. Potter cared nothing for speculative doctrines, and had no sympathy whatsoever with Spencer's religious opinions. Mr. Potter died on January 1, 1892.

The year closes with reminiscences of very early days.

To his Aunt Anna.

28 *December,* 1891.

The receipt of Mrs. Jose's letter suggested to me on Christmas day something which will perhaps interest you. Last summer a very fine piano was presented to me by Mr. Andrew Carnegie, the American millionaire, and it was utilised for reviving my first memory of you in a way which you would perhaps hardly guess. When you were over in Derby during your marriage tour, and when I was a boy of perhaps nine or ten, an evening was spent at the house of my uncle John, and you gave us on the piano one of Beethoven's pieces. I have remembered it ever since, and it has always been a great favourite of mine, and on Christmas day I had it played to me by Miss Baker as being my earliest remembrance associated with you.

The incident recalled the second title of the first of Scott's novels—*Waverley*—"It is sixty years since." What a great deal has passed since then, and how the recollection of it seems to shrivel up into nothing!

DATE DUE

Withdrawn
from
Portchester Library

921.2 Sp33d
Duncan, David, 1839-
Life and letters of Herbert Sp
c.1
150101 000
3 9315 00010795 0
MANCHESTER COLLEGE LIBRARY

921.2
Sp33d v.1
Duncan
Life & letters of Herbert
Spencer

NOV 27 71 70145
DEC 2 72 70924
APR 20 77 75432